

ITEP ??/??

A Candidate for Solvable Large N Lattice Gauge Theory in $D \geq 2$.

Andrey Yu. Dubin

ITEP, B.Chermushkinskaya 25, Moscow 117259, Russia

e-mail: dubin@vxitep.itep.ru

tel.: 7 095 129 9674

fax: 7 095 883 9601

Abstract

I propose a class of $D \geq 2$ lattice $SU(N)$ gauge theories dual to certain vector models endowed with the *local* $[U(N)]^D$ conjugation-invariance and $\mathbf{Z}_N$ gauge symmetry. In the latter models, both the partition function and Wilson loop observables depend nontrivially only on the *eigenvalues* of the link-variables. Therefore, the vector-model facilitates a master-field representation of the large N loop-averages in the corresponding induced gauge system. As for the partition function, in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ it is reduced to the $2D$ th power of an effective *one-matrix eigenvalue*-model which makes the associated phase structure accessible. In particular a simple scaling-condition, that ensures the proper continuum limit of the induced gauge theory, is proposed. We also derive a closed expression for the large N average of a generic nonself-intersecting Wilson loop in the $D = 2$ theory defined on an arbitrary $2d$ surface.

Keywords: Lattice, Yang-Mills, Duality, Solvability, Phase transitions

PACS codes 11.15.Ha; 11.15.Pg

1 Introduction

The theory of confinement in the $D = 4$ continuum $SU(3)$ Yang-Mills gauge system endures as a tantalizing challenge over the last few decades. One possible strategy to deal with this problem was introduced in the seminal paper [1] of K.Wilson. The general idea is to consider a lattice reformulation of the continuum YM theory. In the right universality class, the lattice system undergoes (for certain critical value g_0^2 of the bare coupling constant g^2) a phase transition characterized by the 'divergence' of the correlation length. In this case the continuum YM theory (supposed to be unique in $D = 4$) can be recovered as the low-energy theory at the scales much larger than the lattice spacing, with g^2 approaching g_0^2 along the *Wilsonian* RG trajectory.

The employed so far $D > 2$ lattice YM theories are too unwieldy to handle analytically. Consider for example the most popular subvariety of the one-plaquette $SU(N)$ lattice actions. The latter is defined by associating to each site $\mathbf{x}$ a factor

$$\sum_{\{R_{\mu\nu}\}} e^{-F(\{R_{\mu\nu}\})} \prod_{\mu\nu=1}^{D(D-1)/2} \chi_{R_{\mu\nu}}(U_\mu(\mathbf{x})U_\nu(\mathbf{x}+\mu)U_\mu^+(\mathbf{x}+\nu)U_\nu^+(\mathbf{x})), \quad (1.1)$$

where the multiple Fourier expansion (in terms of $SU(N)$ irreducible representations $R_{\mu\nu}$) involves the holonomies wrapped around $D(D-1)/2$ elementary plaquettes. Besides the space-time dependence, the models like (1.1) depend nontrivially on the $O(N^2)$ degrees of freedom: not only on the $O(N)$ eigenvalues $e^{i\omega_j(\rho)}$, $j = 1, \dots, N$, but also on the *nondiagonal* ('angular') components Ω_ρ of the relevant link-matrices $U_\rho = \Omega_\rho \text{diag}[e^{i\omega(\rho)}] \Omega_\rho^+$, $\rho = 1, \dots, D$.

So far our analytical knowledge about systems of this type has been very limited, with the proper continuum limit of the $D > 2$ lattice gauge systems have been remaining beyond grasping. Besides the YM_2 on a $2d$ surface [9, 4, 8], the available solvable examples are mainly restricted to the situations [2, 3] where the model can be transformed into some *eigenvalue-theory* of q (hermitean or unitary) matrices. The goal of the present paper is to take the reverse way around and *induce* lattice gauge theories from vector-field models of the eigenvalue-type. By definition, the (effective) action of

the latter is formulated in terms of such variables that makes manifest the invariance under the set of α -dependent $[U(N)]^{\oplus q}$ -conjugations

$$S(\{\Psi_\alpha \tilde{W}_\alpha \Psi_\alpha^+\}) = S(\{\tilde{W}_\alpha\}) = \sum_{\{R_\alpha\}} f(\{R_\alpha\}) \prod_{\alpha=1}^q \chi_{R_\alpha}(\tilde{W}_\alpha) , \quad (1.2)$$

where Ψ_α , $\alpha = 1, \dots, q$, is the set of arbitrary $U(N)$ matrices. In other words, the *largest* possible conjugation-invariance (1.2) leads to the crucial simplification: the action $S_{eff}(\{\tilde{W}_\alpha\}) \sim O(N^2)$ depends nontrivially only on the $O(N)$ associated *eigenvalues* $e^{i\theta_j(\alpha)}$ of q (unitary or hermitean) matrices $\tilde{W}_\alpha$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, q$.

To generate a consistent mapping onto the gauge models, I propose to start with the lattice systems defined in terms of the $SU(N)$ link-variables $U_\rho(\mathbf{z})$ and invariant under the *local* $[U(N)]^{\oplus D}$ conjugation-invariance

$$U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow h_\rho^+(\mathbf{z}) U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) h_\rho(\mathbf{z}) , \quad h_\rho \in U(N) , \quad \rho = 1, \dots, D, \quad (1.3)$$

combined with the reduced gauge symmetry with respect to the center T of the Lie group

$$U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow H^+(\mathbf{z}) U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) H(\mathbf{z} + \rho) , \quad H(\mathbf{z}) \in T , \quad T = \mathbf{Z}_N , \quad (1.4)$$

and, as a result of (1.4), with the global $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ -invariance

$$[T]^{\oplus D} : U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow t_\rho U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) , \quad t_\rho \in T = \mathbf{Z}_N . \quad (1.5)$$

This class of eigenvalue-systems, being reduced to the 'one-plaquette' subvariety, can be defined as following. Generalizing eq. (1.1), one is to associate to each site $\mathbf{x}$ the factor

$$\sum_{\{R_{\mu\nu}\}} e^{-S} \prod_{\{\mu\nu\}} \chi_{R_{\mu\nu}}(U_\mu(\mathbf{x})) \chi_{R_{\mu\nu}}(U_\nu(\mathbf{x} + \mu)) \chi_{R_{\mu\nu}}(U_\mu^+(\mathbf{x} + \nu)) \chi_{R_{\mu\nu}}(U_\nu^+(\mathbf{x})), \quad (1.6)$$

(where $S \equiv S(\{R_{\mu\nu}\})$) in compliance with the pattern (1.2). What is even more important, owing to (1.3) the average of a (nonself-intersecting) Wilson loop

$$W_C(U) = tr(U_\mu(\mathbf{x}) U_\nu(\mathbf{x} + \mu) \dots U_\rho(\mathbf{x} - \rho)) = tr\left(\prod_{\{\mathbf{z}_k \in C\}} U_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k)\right) \quad (1.7)$$

can be also directly expressed, as we will see, in terms of the corresponding eigenvalues

$$\langle W_C(U) \rangle = N^{1-L_C} \langle \prod_{\{\mathbf{z}_k \in C\}} \text{tr}(U_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k)) \rangle . \quad (1.8)$$

The mapping of the model like (1.6) onto the corresponding gauge system is to be performed in the two steps. First, we introduce the auxiliary $SU(N)$ scalar field $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{z})$ (assigned to the lattice sites)

$$U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow \tilde{G}^+(\mathbf{z}) U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \tilde{G}(\mathbf{z} + \rho) \quad , \quad \rho = 1, \dots, D, \quad (1.9)$$

via the 'gauge-transformation' that leaves invariant both the $SU(N)$ measure $DU_\rho(\mathbf{z})$ and the Wilson loop observables (1.7). Second, one integrates over the scalar field $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{z})$ with the Haar measure (normalized by $\int d\tilde{G}(\mathbf{z}) = 1$) that results in the associated effective theory with the manifestly gauge-invariant action $\tilde{S}_{eff}(\{U_\rho(\mathbf{z})\})$. Indeed, after the extension (1.9) the corresponding action $S(\{G^+(\mathbf{z})U_\mu(\mathbf{z})\tilde{G}(\mathbf{z} + \mu)\})$ is invariant under the gauge transformations

$$\bar{U}_\mu(\mathbf{z}) = g^+(\mathbf{z}) U_\mu(\mathbf{z}) g(\mathbf{z} + \mu) \quad , \quad \bar{G}(\mathbf{z}) = g^+(\mathbf{z}) \tilde{G}(\mathbf{z}) \quad , \quad (1.10)$$

formulated for $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{z})$ in the unconventional way. The crucial consequence of the 'extended' gauge symmetry (1.10) is that the induced $\tilde{S}_{eff}(\{U_\rho(\mathbf{z})\})$ necessarily assumes the conventional form of the *multi*-plaquette lattice *YM* action composed from the generic *closed* Wilson loops (1.7). In other words, the Haar integrations over $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{z})$ *intertwine* the contractions of the $U_\rho(\mathbf{z})$ -tensors to recollect the latter into the gauge-invariant combinations (1.7). For example, a single $\mu\nu$ -component of the block-product in eq. (1.6) after the four different $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{z})$ -integrations (referred to the sites of the corresponding elementary $\mu\nu$ -plaquette) is mapped onto

$$\sim \chi_{R_{\mu\nu}}(U_\mu(\mathbf{x})U_\nu(\mathbf{x} + \mu)U_\mu^+(\mathbf{x} + \nu)U_\nu^+(\mathbf{x})) . \quad (1.11)$$

By construction, the gauge systems induced via (1.9) from the eigenvalue-models (1.6) (invariant under (1.3)-(1.5)) are endowed with the *same* set of symmetries as the conventional lattice gauge theories like the Wilson's one. In this perspective, the local $[U(N)]^{\oplus D}$ -symmetry (1.3) can be viewed as the

'hidden' symmetry inherent (via (1.9)) in the proposed family of the induced gauge theories. It is due to this symmetry the number of the active degrees of freedom *per site* is thus substantially reduced

$$O((D-1)N^2) \rightarrow O(DN) \quad (1.12)$$

as the action (1.6) does not depend on the *nondiagonal* components $\Omega_\rho(\mathbf{z})$ of $U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) = \Omega_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \text{diag}[e^{i\theta(\rho|\mathbf{z})}] \Omega_\rho^+(\mathbf{z})$, $\rho = 1, \dots, D$. Nevertheless, even after this considerable reduction the model (1.6) is still not transparent enough to allow for an exact solution. This forces us to search for potentially solvable cousins of the $SU(3)$ eigenvalue-systems among their $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} SU(N)$ counterparts keeping certain analogue of the 't Hooft coupling $g^2 N$ to be $\sim O(N^0)$. In this limit, due to (1.8) the eigenvalue-model (1.6) can be viewed as a realization of the master-field representation for the large N loop-averages (1.7) in the associated (via (1.9)) induced gauge theory.

Indeed, in the large N limit the $\Omega_\rho(\mathbf{z})$ -independence of (1.6) becomes particularly advantageous. Let the weight $e^{-S(\{R_{\mu\nu}\})}$ in eq. (1.6) be a generic function consistent with the $O(N^2)$ -scaling of the free energy. Owing to the reduction (1.12) of the active degrees of freedom, in the computation of the large N partition function and loop-averages (1.8) one can employ the good old saddle-point method. The latter is to be applied *either* to the $D \times (N-1)$ eigenvalues $\text{diag}[e^{i\omega(\rho|\mathbf{z})}]$ of $U_\rho(\mathbf{z})$ themselves (akin to [10]) *or* to their Fourier duals (similarly to [5]) - the $SU(N)$ representations $R_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{z})$ parametrized by the corresponding sets of $N-1$ integers $\lambda_j(\mu\nu|\mathbf{z})$, $j = 1, \dots, N-1$. To generate additional simplifications, we constrain the weight $e^{-S(\{R_{\mu\nu}\})}$ to be invariant under the group-product

$$S(D(D-1)/2) \otimes \mathbf{Z}_2 \quad ; \quad \mathbf{Z}_2 : \otimes_{\{\mu\nu\}} R_{\mu\nu} \leftrightarrow \otimes_{\{\mu\nu\}} \bar{R}_{\mu\nu}. \quad (1.13)$$

It combines the group of permutations within the $\{\mu\nu\}$ -set of the irrep-indices with the *simultaneous* $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -conjugation ($\chi_R(U^+) = \chi_{\bar{R}}(U)$) of *all* the involved irreps. The $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -symmetry plays, as we will see, an important role for the consistency of the large N construction.

Altogether, the partition function $\tilde{X}_{L^D}$ of the large N lattice YM theory induced from (1.6) (in a D -volume L^D) is reproduced

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_{L^D} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\tilde{X}_r)^{L^D}, \quad (1.14)$$

through the partition function X_r of the associated $D(D-1)/2$ -plaquette $SU(N)$ model with the reduced space-time dependence

$$e^{-S_r(\{U_\rho\})} = \sum_{\{R_{\mu\nu}\}} e^{-S(\{R_{\mu\nu}\})} \prod_{\{\mu\nu\}} |\chi_{R_{\mu\nu}}(U_\mu) \chi_{R_{\mu\nu}}(U_\nu)|^2 \quad (1.15)$$

which is invariant under $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ symmetry

$$[T]^{\oplus D} : U_\rho \rightarrow t_\rho U_\rho \quad , \quad t_\rho \in T = \mathbf{Z}_N \quad , \quad (1.16)$$

and formulated in terms of the eigenvalues of D different link-variables U_ρ instead of the DL^D original eigenvalues of $U_\rho(\mathbf{z})$. It is instructive to rewrite first the large N partition function $\tilde{X}_r$ as the specific *generating functional*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_r = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sum_{\{R_\rho\}} \sum_{\{R_{\mu\nu}\}} e^{-S(\{R_{\mu\nu}\})/2} \otimes_{\rho=1}^D L_{R_\rho|\{R_{\rho\nu}\}}^{(D-1)} \right]^2 \quad (1.17)$$

of the D -products of the generalized Littlewood-Richardson (GLR) coefficients of the $(D-1)th$ order

$$L_{R_\rho|\{R_{\rho\nu}\}}^{(D-1)} = \int dU_\rho^{SU(N)} \chi_{R_\rho}(U_\rho^+) [\otimes_{\nu \neq \rho}^{D-1} \chi_{R_{\rho\nu}}(U_\rho)] \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad (1.18)$$

assuming nonnegative *integer* values.

As we will see, the invariance of $e^{-S(\{R_{\mu\nu}\})}$ under (1.13) is sufficient for the reduction of the large N representation (1.17) to the $2Dth$ power

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_r = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sum_{R(\{\lambda\})}'' e^{-S(R|D)} \right]^{2D} \quad (1.19)$$

of an effective *one*-matrix $SU(N)$ model formulated in terms of the $\{\lambda\}$ -set of $N-1$ integers λ_j , $j = 1, \dots, N-1$, which parametrize canonically the $SU(N)$ irreps $R \equiv R(\{\lambda\})$. The sum $\sum_R''$, being the large N 'image' of the D summations over $\{R_\rho\}$ in eq. (1.17), is dynamically constrained by the following condition. Let $n(R)$ stand for the number of boxes in the $SU(N)$ Young tableau $Y_{n(R)}^{(N)}$ associated to R . Then, in (1.19) both $n(R)$ and $n(\bar{R})$ must be nonnegative multiples of $(D-1)$. Next, taking advantage of the freedom to choose $S(\{R_{\mu\nu}\})$ in eq. (1.17), the $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -invariant effective action $S(R|D) = S(\bar{R}|D)$ in (1.19) can be judiciously selected in *any* required form consistent with $-\ln[\tilde{X}_r] \sim O(N^2)$. In what follows, our attention will

be restricted to the simplest *solvable* class of the $SU(N)$ or $U(N)$ models with $S(R|D)$ being defined as

$$e^{-S(\{\lambda\})} = |\dim R(\{\lambda\})|^q e^{-\sum_{n=1}^{M_0} \sum_{\tilde{r} \in Y_{2n}} g_{\tilde{r}(\{p\})} \prod_{k=1}^{2n} [\sum_{i=1}^N (\lambda_i - \frac{N-1}{2})^k]^{p_k}} \quad (1.20)$$

where $q > 0$. In the $SU(N)$ case the set $\{g_{\tilde{r}(\{p\})}\}$ is supposed to be invariant under the translations $\lambda_i \rightarrow \lambda_i + m$ to match with the standard $SU(N)$ condition $\lambda_N = 0$. As for the sum $\sum_{\tilde{r}}$ in the exponent, it runs over the irreps $\tilde{r} \equiv \tilde{r}(\{p\}) \in Y_{2n}$ of the even symmetric group $S(2n)$ (labelled by the partitions $\{p\} = [1^{p_1} 2^{p_2} \dots 2n^{p_{2n}}]$ of $2n$: $\sum_{k=1}^{2n} k p_k = 2n$) with $n \leq M_0 \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 1}$.

Finally, the organization of the paper is as following. In Section 2 we present the details of the large N reduction (1.14) representing X_r in the form of the GLR generating functional (1.17). In Section 3, the transformation of the large N GLR functional (1.17) into the 1-matrix representation (1.19) is explicitly performed, and the large N scaling properties of the selected 1-matrix family (1.19) are formulated. The continuum limit (CL) in the gauge theories induced from the models like (1.6) is analysed in Section 4. We propose a simple criterion for the reduced 1-matrix system (1.20) to ensure the *localization* $\{U_\rho \rightarrow \hat{1}\}$ (modulo (1.16)) in the infinitesimal vicinity, scaling as $O(N^0)$, of the group-unity $\hat{1}$. In turn, it predetermines that in the associated induced gauge theory the link-variables are as well localized $\{U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow \hat{1}\}$ (modulo (1.5) and the gauge symmetry) which is tantamount to the proper CL. The phenomenon of the auxiliary 'continuum' limits (which accompany the conventional CL) in the effective system (1.19) is also discussed in connection with the large N phase transitions (PT).

In Section 5 we derive a closed expressions for the large N average of a generic nonself-intersecting Wilson loop in the two-dimensional eigenvalue-system (1.6) on an arbitrary $2d$ discretized closed surface. Building on this expression, we associate to a given eigenvalue-system (1.6) the corresponding gauge theory (1.1) in such a way that both of them are supposed to have (in $D = 2$) the same CL. The general pattern of averages (including self-intersecting loops and irreducible multi-loop correlators) is discussed in Section 6. Some peculiarities of the large N pattern of the (multi)loop averages (1.7) are revealed and interpreted. In the last section we make our

conclusions and discuss possible directions of further research. The Appendices contain technical details employed in the main text.

2 Large N reduction of the GLR Functional.

Let us proceed with the derivation of the reduced representation (1.14) of the large N partition function $\tilde{X}_{L^D}$ of the proposed eigenvalue-model (1.6). We will demonstrate also that reduced actions like (1.15), in fact, reproduce partition function of a *larger* family of eigenvalue-systems including the 'multi-plaquette' generalizations of (1.6).

To begin with, one notes that in the theory (1.6), X_{L^D} can be readily represented in the form which associates to each site $\mathbf{z}$ of the base-lattice the properly weighted sum of the blocks

$$\otimes_{\rho=1}^D \int dU_{\rho} \otimes_{\nu \neq \rho}^{D-1} [\chi_{R_{\rho\nu}(\mathbf{z}-\nu)}(U_{\rho}^+(\mathbf{z})) \chi_{R_{\rho\nu}(\mathbf{z})}(U_{\rho}(\mathbf{z}))] \quad (2.1)$$

composed of the characters which in (1.6) are referred to the plaquettes sharing the D ρ -links based at $\mathbf{z}$. Employing the standard fusion-rules of the Lie group characters

$$\otimes_{k=1}^p \chi_{R_k}(V) = \sum_{k=1}^p \chi_{R_+}(V) L_{R_+|\{R_k\}}^{(p)}, \quad (2.2)$$

the combination (2.1) can be rewritten in terms of the GLR coefficients

$$\otimes_{\rho=1}^D L_{R_{\rho}(\mathbf{z})|\{R_{\rho\nu}(\mathbf{z}-\nu)\}}^{(D-1)} L_{R_{\rho}(\mathbf{z})|\{R_{\rho\nu}(\mathbf{z})\}}^{(D-1)}. \quad (2.3)$$

Consider the representation of $\tilde{X}_{L^D}$ in terms of the GLR blocks (2.3) and let the number of sites $L^D \ll N$ while $-\ln[\tilde{X}_{L^D}] \sim O(N^2)$. The remaining summations over $R_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{z}), R_{\rho}(\mathbf{z})$, being parametrized by the $O(L^D N)$ integers, in the large N limit can be evaluated with the help of the saddle-point (SP) approach (in a manner akin to [5]; see also Section 4). Since the SP irreps are supposed to be space-time independent

$$R_{\mu\nu}^{(0)}(\mathbf{z}) = R_{\mu\nu}^{(0)}, \quad R_{\rho}^{(0)}(\mathbf{z}) = R_{\rho}^{(0)}, \quad (2.4)$$

the SP equations in the L^D -lattice theory (1.6) are reduced to the SP equations derived from the functional (1.17) associated to the reduced model (1.15). In relating (1.17) and (1.15) we have used also the ($\gamma = 2$ case of the) identity

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int \prod_{\alpha=1}^p \sum_{R_\alpha} e^{-S_p(\{R_\beta\})} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} [\int \prod_{\alpha=1}^p \sum_{R_\alpha} e^{-S_p(\{R_\beta\})/\gamma}]^\gamma , \quad (2.5)$$

valid provided that $\gamma > 0$, the saddle-point values of *both* $e^{-S_p(\{R_\beta^{(0)}\})}$ and $e^{-S_p(\{R_\beta^{(0)}\})/\gamma}$ are unique and *positive*, while $-\ln[\tilde{X}_p] \sim O(N^2)$. Indeed, in this case the equivalence of the saddle-point equations, associated to both sides of (2.5), is sufficient to prove this identity.

It is instructive to rederive the $[\tilde{X}_r]^{L^D} \leftrightarrow \tilde{X}_{L^D}$ correspondence (1.14) applying the SP method directly to the eigenvalues $\text{diag}[e^{i\omega(\rho|\mathbf{z})}]$ of $U_\rho(\mathbf{z})$. The effective action $S_{eff}(\{\omega_j(\rho|\mathbf{z})\}) \sim O(N^2)$, where by definition

$$\tilde{X}_{L^D} = \int \prod_{j,\rho,\mathbf{z}} \frac{d\omega_j(\rho|\mathbf{z})}{2\pi} \exp[-S_{eff}(\{\omega_j(\rho|\mathbf{z})\})] , \quad (2.6)$$

is composed of the two parts $S_{eff} = S_0 + S_J$. The 'bare' part $S_0(\{\omega\})$ is associated to the factor (1.6) rewritten as $e^{-S_0(\{\omega\})}$. The remaining contribution $S_J = -\sum_{\rho,\mathbf{z}} \ln[\Delta(\{\omega_p(\rho|\mathbf{z})\})]$ is due to the Jacobian induced by the change of the variables

$$\int dU = \int d\Omega \prod_{k=1}^N \int_{-\pi}^{+\pi} \frac{d\omega_k}{2\pi} \Delta(\{\omega_p\}) \equiv \int d\Omega J(T) dT , \quad (2.7)$$

$$\Delta(\{\omega_p\}) = \delta^{[2\pi]} \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \omega_k \right) \prod_{i < j} |2 \sin(\frac{\omega_i - \omega_j}{2})|^2 , \quad T = \text{diag}[e^{i\omega}] , \quad (2.8)$$

introducing, $U = \Omega \text{diag}[e^{i\omega}] \Omega^+$, the 'angular' (nondiagonal) Ω - and 'radial' (diagonal) $\text{diag}[e^{i\omega}]$ -components. According to (2.8) and the Weyl character formula [7]

$$\chi_{R(\{\lambda\})}(U) = \det_{k,j}(e^{i\lambda_k \omega_j}) / \det_{k,j}(e^{i(N-k)\omega_j}) , \quad (2.9)$$

the action $S_{eff}(\{\omega_j(\rho|\mathbf{z})\})$ (in addition to the symmetries (1.3)-(1.5)) is invariant under the $S(N)$ Weyl group of the the permutations

$$\omega_j(\rho|\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow \omega_{\sigma(j)}(\rho|\mathbf{z}) , \quad \sigma \in S(N) . \quad (2.10)$$

In what follows, the latter symmetry is supposed to be 'fixed' by the Faddeev-Popov condition $\omega_j^{(0)}(\rho|\mathbf{z}) > \omega_{j+1}^{(0)}(\rho|\mathbf{z})$. Having imposed this constraint, there still remains the whole *orbit* of the SP solutions $\omega_j^{(0)}(\rho|\mathbf{z})$ generated apparently by the finite N symmetries (1.4),(1.5).

The subtlety is that the leading $O(N^2)$ order of $S_{eff}(\{\omega_j^{(0)}(\rho|\mathbf{z})\})$ (restricted to the to the SP values $\{\omega^{(0)}\}$) is invariant under the extended *local* $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^{\oplus D}$ symmetry

$$[\mathbf{Z}_N]^{\oplus D} : U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow t_\rho(\mathbf{z})U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \quad , \quad t_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \in \mathbf{Z}_N \quad , \quad (2.11)$$

which is broken by the *subleading* orders of S_{eff} down to (1.4),(1.5). We refer to Appendix A for the details and now simply make use of (2.11). In particular, it implies that (having fixed (2.10)) the residual $SU(N)$ SP orbit is supposed to be generated from a unique and space-time independent solution $\omega_j^{(0)}(\rho|\mathbf{z})$ by the set of transformations (2.11) which is larger than (1.4),(1.5). Employing for (2.6) the analogue of the identity (2.5) (readily modified to account for the degeneracy (2.11)), one arrives at the required correspondence (1.14) between $[\tilde{X}_r]^{L^D}$ and $\tilde{X}_{L^D}$.

As a side remark, in the computation of a large N average of a nonself-intersecting Wilson loop (1.7) the subleading orders of $S_{eff}(\{\omega_j(\rho|\mathbf{z})\})$ must be necessarily included. It will be clear from Sections 5 and 6 (see also Appendix A). Consequently, as far as the $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle W_C(U) \rangle$ averages is concerned, the extended symmetry (2.11) is *not* observable directly (although leading to certain peculiarities discussed in Section 6).

Now we are ready to formulate the following correspondence that will be used in Section 4 for the analysis of the continuum limit. The latter limit takes place if in the (induced) gauge theory the link-variables are localized in a vicinity, scaling as $O(N^0)$, of the group-unity $\hat{1} : U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow \hat{1}$ modulo (1.5) and the $SU(N)$ gauge symmetry. Let in the associated reduced system (1.15) the coupling constants of $S_r(\{U_\rho\})$ are adjusted to provide with similar localization $U_\rho \rightarrow \hat{1}$ (modulo (1.16)). The previous SP analysis implies that this constraint on $S_r(\{U_\rho\})$ ensures that in the corresponding eigenvalue-system (1.6) the link-variables $U_\rho(\mathbf{z})$ (entering the Wilson loop observables) are as well localized

$$U_\rho \rightarrow \hat{1} \quad \text{mod (1.16)} \implies U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow \hat{1} \quad \text{mod } \{(1.4), (1.5)\} \quad , \quad \forall \rho. \quad (2.12)$$

In turn, the pattern of the mapping (1.9) guarantees that in the associated induced gauge theory the condition (2.12) results in the required localization of $U_\rho(\mathbf{z})$.

Finally, let us note that the SP analysis (applied to $\text{diag}[e^{i\omega(\rho|\mathbf{z})}]$) reveals the following direction to generalize the 1-plaquette family (1.6) of the eigenvalue-models with the partition function reproduced via the reduced system (1.15). First, with the help of the Frobenius formula [7] one is to expand the characters entering (1.6) in terms of the trace products $\prod_{k=1}^n [\text{tr}(U^k(\mathbf{z}))]^{p_k}$. Consider a set of such products associated to the plaquette-factor based at a particular site $\mathbf{x}$. The idea is to change the arguments in each $\text{tr}(U^k(\mathbf{x}))$ separately trading $\mathbf{x}$ for generic sites. The only natural restriction for such interchange is that the new set of the trace products remains invariant under the $[\mathbf{Z}_N]$ gauge symmetry (1.4). In this way, one constructs an eigenvalue-counterpart of the gauge theories with the action depending on the multi-plaquette Wilson loops. Provided the interchanges are performed in the same way for all lattice reference-sites $\mathbf{z}$, the SP values of $\text{diag}[e^{i\omega(\rho|\mathbf{z})}]$ are supposed to be translationally invariant (modulo (2.10) and (2.11)). Consequently, by construction of the interchange the partition function of the deformed eigenvalue-system is still reproduced in the large N limit by the same reduced model (1.15). Actually, there are many other ways to generalize (1.6) preserving the structure of the associated reduced system.

3 The effective $N \rightarrow \infty$ 1-matrix theory.

Further reduction of the GLR functional (1.17) to the '1-matrix' representation (1.19) is built on the localization of the large N summations over $\{R(\rho)\} \otimes \{R(\mu\nu)\}$ on the solution $\{R^{(0)}(\rho)\} \otimes \{R^{(0)}(\mu\nu)\}$ of the corresponding saddle-point equations. We defer the discussion of these equations until the next section, and now simply assert the expected properties of the solution in the case when the constraints (1.13) are additionally imposed. To be more specific, we select the option when the effective 1-matrix system in eq. (1.19) is reduced to the family (1.20). Altogether, the saddle-point $SU(N)$ -set $\{R^{(0)}(\rho)\} \otimes \{R^{(0)}(\mu\nu)\}$,

$$R^{(0)}(\rho) = R^{(0)} = \bar{R}^{(0)}, \quad \forall \rho \quad ; \quad R^{(0)}(\mu\nu) = R_2^{(0)} = \bar{R}_2^{(0)}, \quad \forall \mu\nu, \quad (3.1)$$

is supposed to be *unique*, $\{\rho\} \otimes \{\mu\nu\}$ independent respectively, and *selfdual*. As a result, the generating functional (1.17) is equivalent in the large N limit to the *reduced* system obtained after the identification

$$R(\mu\nu) \equiv R_2 \in Y_{n_2}^{(N)} \quad , \quad R(\rho) \equiv R \in Y_n^{(N)} \quad , \quad (3.2)$$

with the remaining summations over R , R_2 being localized on the same saddle-point values (3.1).

Since the reduced action (1.15) is composed of the blocks containing equal amounts of U_ρ and U_ρ^+ $SU(N)$ factors, $S_r(\{U_\rho\})$ is invariant under the larger set of transformations (1.16) where $\mathbf{Z}_N$ is extended to $U(1)$. As a result, the partition function $\tilde{X}_r$ is invariant under the substitution of the $SU(N)$ link-variables by the $U(N) = [SU(N) \otimes U(1)]/\mathbf{Z}_N$ ones

$$U_\rho^{SU(N)} \rightarrow U_\rho^{U(N)} \quad , \quad \forall \rho \quad . \quad (3.3)$$

Complementary, the involved $SU(N)$ irreps R_ϕ can be viewed as belonging to the (anti)chiral subset of the $U(N)$ ones. Owing to (3.3), the sum in (1.17) over $SU(N)$ irreps R is effectively constrained by the $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -invariant pair of the $U(N)$ conditions (nontrivial in $D > 2$)

$$L_{R|\bar{R}}^{(D-1)} \neq 0 \Rightarrow n(R) = n(R_2)(D-1) \quad , \quad n(\bar{R}) = n(\bar{R}_2)(D-1), \quad (3.4)$$

predetermined by the pattern of $U(N)$ GLR coefficients corresponding to (1.18). In eq. (3.4), the integers $n(R_\phi), n(\bar{R}_\phi) \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ denote the number of boxes in the $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -invariant pair of the Young tableaux corresponding to (3.2):

$$n(R(\{\lambda\})) = \sum_{i=1}^N n_i = \sum_{i=1}^N (\lambda_i - N + i). \quad (3.5)$$

Recall also that the irreps of $U(N)$ are labelled by a set of N integers $\lambda_i^{U(N)}$ (constrained by $\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \lambda_i = \lambda_N \bmod N$)

$$\{\lambda^{U(N)}\} = \{\lambda_1 + \lambda_N > \dots > \lambda_{N-1} + \lambda_N > \lambda_N\} \in [\mathbf{Z}^{\oplus N}/S(N)] \quad (3.6)$$

generated from the $SU(N)$ -sets of $N-1$ *nonnegative* integers $\{\lambda^{SU(N)}\} = \{\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \dots > \lambda_{N-1} > 0\}$ by the extra integer number $\lambda_N \geq 0$ or $\lambda_N < 0$. As for the $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -conjugation $R \leftrightarrow \bar{R}$, it reads

$$\{\lambda_i\} \leftrightarrow \{-\lambda_{N-i+1} + \beta\} \quad , \quad (3.7)$$

where $\beta^{U(N)} = (N - 1)$ and $\beta^{SU(N)} = \lambda_1$ in the $U(N)$ and $SU(N)$ cases respectively.

Next, the effective action for R, R_2 , resulting from the reduction (3.2), contains (according to (1.17)) the D th power of $L_{R|R_2^{\oplus D-1}}^{(D-1)}$. To simplify this expression further, one can employ the ($\gamma = D$ case of the) identity (2.5). Altogether, it defines the *one*-matrix representation of the large N family (1.17)

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_r = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\int dU^{U(N)} \sum_{R, R_2} e^{-\frac{S^{(D)}(R_2)}{2D}} \chi_R(U^+) [\chi_{R_2}(U)]^{D-1} \right]^{2D}, \quad (3.8)$$

where the weight $S^{(D)}(R_2) = S(\{R(\mu\nu)\})|_{\{R(\mu\nu)=R_2\}}$ is deduced from that of (1.17) through the 'dimensional' reduction (3.2). The integrated in (3.8) expression is simply related to the associated reduced action $S_r(\{U_\rho\})$. Consider first the case of the *separable* weight $S(\{R(\mu\nu)\}) = \sum_{\{\mu\nu\}} S(R(\mu\nu))$ which results in $S^{(D)}(R_2) = D(D-1)S(R_2)/2$. Once the $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -selfduality (3.1) of $R_2^{(0)}$ takes place, the identity (2.5) can be applied once more (this time with $\gamma = (D-1)/4$)

$$\sum_{R_2} [e^{-S(R_2)} \chi_{R_2}^4(U)]^{\frac{D-1}{4}} \rightarrow \left[\sum_{R_2} e^{-S(R_2)} |\chi_{R_2}(U)|^4 \right]^{\frac{(D-1)}{4}} = e^{-\frac{S_r(\{U\})}{2D}}, \quad (3.9)$$

where $e^{-S_r(\{U\})} \equiv e^{-S_r(\{U_\rho\})}|_{\{U_\rho=U\}}$ stands for the original reduced action (1.15) with coinciding arguments. As a result, eq. (3.8) assumes the concise form

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_r = \left[\sum_R \int dU \exp\left[-\frac{S_r(\{U\})}{2D}\right] \chi_R(U^+) \right]^{2D}. \quad (3.10)$$

Upon a reflection, the representation (3.10) remains valid (provided the $S(D(D-1)/2)$ -invariance (1.13) of $S(\{R(\mu\nu)\})$) for a generic, *not* necessarily separable form of the weight $S(\{R(\mu\nu)\})$.

It is appropriate to remark that the consistency of a substitution like (3.9) requires the positivity $\chi_{R_2^{(0)}}(\text{diag}[e^{i\omega^{(0)}}]) = [\chi_{R_2^{(0)}}(\text{diag}[e^{i\omega^{(0)}}])]^+ > 0$, where $R_2^{(0)}$ is defined by eq. (3.1) while $\omega_i^{(0)}$ is the saddle-point *orbit* on which the integral (3.8) over the U -eigenvalues ω_i is localized. Also, the solution $\omega_i^{(0)}$

is supposed to be unique modulo the symmetries leaving $L_{R|R_2^{\oplus D-1}}^{(D-1)}$ invariant, i.e. the $S(N)$ Weyl group (2.10) combined with the center-transformations (1.16).

Next, let us introduce the Fourier-dual partner $e^{-H(R|D)}$ of $e^{-\frac{S_r(\{U\})}{2D}}$,

$$e^{-H(R|D)} = \sum_{R_2} \exp\left[-\frac{S^{(D)}(R_2)}{2D}\right] L_{R|R_2^{\oplus D-1}}^{(D-1)}, \quad (3.11)$$

so that $e^{-S_r(\{U\})/2D} = \sum_{R_1} e^{-H(R_1|D)} \chi_{R_1}(U)$. As a result, employing the standard orthogonality of the characters, eq. (3.10) is readily transformed into the required form (1.19). Note also that we have introduced an implicit dependence of $H(R|D)$ on D .

Let $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -invariant $e^{-S^{(D)}(R_2)/2D}$ -factor be an arbitrary function of R_2 consistent with $-\ln[\tilde{X}_r] \sim O(N^2)$. The central question at this step is what are the general constraints defining the whole $e^{-H(R|D)}$ -family of weights induced from the $e^{-S^{(D)}(R_2)/2D}$ -variety via (3.11). Upon a reflection, the pattern of the $U(N)$ GLR coefficients ensures that the *only* defining property of the $e^{-H(R|D)}$ -family is the $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -invariant pair of the $D > 2$ conditions (3.4) on the involved $SU(N)$ irreps. In other words, given *any* irrep $R \in Y_{(D-1)m}^{(N)}$ we expect that there exists at least one irrep $\bar{R} \in Y_m^{(N)}$ so that $L_{R|\bar{R}}^{(D-1)} \neq 0$. It suggests to factorize the constraints (3.4) out

$$e^{-H(R|D)} = e^{-S(R|D)} \sum_{k, \bar{k} \in \mathbf{Z}} \delta_{n(R), [D-1]k} \delta_{n(\bar{R}), [D-1]\bar{k}}. \quad (3.12)$$

Summarizing, for a *fixed* D a generic residual R -valued function $e^{-S(R|D)}$ (consistent with $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -invariance $S(R|D) = S(\bar{R}|D)$ and with the scaling $-\ln[\tilde{X}_r] \sim O(N^2)$) can be induced through (3.11) provided the judicious adjustment of $e^{-S^{(D)}(R_2)/2D}$.

To make the representation (3.12) practical, the two *periodic Kronecker* delta-functions are introduced via ' ε -regularization' of the Poisson resummation formula

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} \delta_{n, [D-1]k} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_{p \in \mathbf{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{f(n, p, \varepsilon)}{(D-1)}\right] \sqrt{\varepsilon/[D-1]}, \quad (3.13)$$

$$f(n, p, \varepsilon) = 2\pi[\varepsilon p^2 - i np]. \quad (3.14)$$

Altogether, it results in the 1-matrix representation of the $SU(N)$ GLR functional (1.17)

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_r = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{[D-1]} \sum_{p, \bar{p} \in \mathbf{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}} \sum_{R \in Y_n^{(N)}} \exp(-A) \right]^{2D} \quad (3.15)$$

$$A = S(R|D) + \frac{f(n(R), p, \varepsilon) + f(n(\bar{R}), \bar{p}, \varepsilon)}{D-1}. \quad (3.16)$$

Remark that if the additional $D > 2$ constrains (3.4) in (1.19) were omitted, the $D \geq 2$ pattern (3.15) of $\tilde{X}_r$ would be essentially two-dimensional. Indeed, eq. (3.15) would reduce to the $[2D]th$ -power of the partition function associated (when in eq. (1.20) $q = 2$) to the continuum *generalized* $2d$ YM on a sphere [8, 4].

In conclusion, we note that similar analysis of the $U(N)$ reduced model (1.15) (with the sum running over the $U(N)$ irreps) results in the $U(N)$ counterparts of eqs. (3.10) and (3.15).

3.1 The large N scaling in the selected family of the 1-matrix models.

Let us now discuss what conditions make the large N limit of the selected 1-matrix variety (1.20) well defined and consistent with the scaling $-\ln[\tilde{X}_r] \sim O(N^2)$, $|\lambda_j| \sim O(N)$. As we will see in Section 4, the latter scaling is necessary to ensure the applicability of the saddle-point method to the summations over the integer-valued $\{\lambda\}$ -fields parametrizing relevant irreps.

To begin with, for each $r(\{p\}) \in Y_{2n}$ one is to perform the proper change of the variables

$$\bar{\lambda}_j = \lambda_j/N, \quad g_{r(\{p\})} = b_{r(\{p\})} N^{\gamma_r}, \quad \gamma_{r(\{p\})} = 2 - 2n - \sum_{k=1}^{2n} p_k, \quad (3.17)$$

postulating that $b_{r(\{p\})} \sim O(N^0)$. Next, the Weyl character formula yields for the irrep dimension

$$\dim R(\{\lambda\}) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)/(j - i), \quad (3.18)$$

which foreshadows the constraint $\lambda_i > \lambda_{i+1}$ inherent in the pattern (3.6) of the irrep-parametrization. Combining the latter constraint with the adjustment (3.17), one concludes that the $O(N^2)$ -order of $-\ln(\tilde{X}_r)$ is *necessarily* accumulated by those of $|\lambda_j|$ which are $\sim O(N)$:

$$\{|\lambda_i| \sim O(N)\} \iff S(\{\lambda\}) \sim O(N^2), \quad (3.19)$$

which altogether justifies that the characteristic values of $\bar{\lambda}_j = \lambda_j/N$ are $\sim O(N^0)$. For definiteness, in the derivation of eq. (3.19) we have supposed that $S(\{\lambda\})|_{\{\lambda_j=(N-1)/2\}} \sim O(N^0)$ when λ_j assume (unadmissible) coinciding values $\lambda_j = (N-1)/2, \forall j$. This choice of the additive constant in the definition of $S(\{\lambda\})$ matches with the introduced pattern (1.20).

We will need also the alternative representation of the 'measure' in (1.20) when the constrained sum $\{\lambda\} \in [\mathbf{Z}^{\oplus N}/S(N)]$ over the strictly decreasing integers is identically (for $q > 0$) transformed into the unconstrained sum over the *independent* integers $\{\lambda\} \in \mathbf{Z}^{\oplus N}$

$$\sum_{\{\lambda\} \in [\mathbf{Z}^{\oplus N}/S(N)]} e^{-S(\{\lambda\})} = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\{\lambda\} \in \mathbf{Z}^{\oplus N}} e^{-S(\{\lambda\})}, \quad (3.20)$$

where $S(\{\lambda_i\}) = S(\{\lambda_{\sigma(i)}\})$, $\sigma \in S(N)$. It renders manifest the 'built in' Weyl group of the $S(N)$ -permutations, so that the constraint $\lambda_i > \lambda_{i+1}$ can be reinterpreted as the 'fixing' of the Weyl symmetry. As a result, the specific scaling (3.19) can be viewed in fact as a consequence of the $S(N)$ -invariance of $S(\{\lambda\})$ augmented by the property that $e^{-S(\{\lambda\})}$ vanishes (owing to (3.18)) on *any* boundary of the Weyl chamber, i.e. for $\forall \{\lambda_i = \lambda_j, i \neq j\}$.

4 The Continuum Limit and Large N PTs.

The general idea of the continuum limit in lattice theories is captured by the well-known intuitively transparent condition. Namely, the properly introduced correlation length must tend to infinity (in the units of the lattice spacing) so that the discrete space-time is 'smoothed-out', for the low-energy theory, into the continuum manifold. In the lattice gauge systems, the relevant coupling constant(s) should be adjusted in such a way that the Wilson

loop averages $\langle W_C(U) \rangle$ undergo infinitely small changes when the contour C is deformed *microscopically* (i.e. at the scales of the *lattice* cut off).

Although in a general case this criterion is rather difficult to implement analytically, the specific structure of the lattice gauge theories suggests a simpler alternative. It is intuitively clear that the infinite correlation length is supposed to entail the *localization* (modulo (1.5) and the gauge transformations) of the link-variables $U_\rho(\mathbf{z})$ in the infinitesimal vicinity of the group-unity element $\hat{1}$. To be more specific, let us fix first the 'maximal tree' gauge [7] putting $U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) = \hat{1}$ on a largest possible *tree* (made of the links) which by definition does not contain nontrivial 1-cycles. Then, introducing the quantum fluctuations $A_\rho^{ab}(\mathbf{z}) = -i \ln[U_\rho^{ab}(\mathbf{z})]$, the required localization can be formulated in the large N limit in the form

$$\lim_{\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0} \langle [A_\rho^{ab}(\mathbf{z})]^2 \rangle \sim O(\tilde{g}^2) \text{ mod (1.5) }, \quad \forall a, b = 1, \dots, N, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\tilde{g}^2 N \equiv \tilde{g}^2(\{g_k\})N \rightarrow 0$ is some $O(N^0)$ functional (see below) of the relevant coupling constants $\{g_k\}$ that is supposed to approach zero. The gauge-invariant representation of (4.1) evidently reads as

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0} \left| \frac{1}{N} \langle \text{tr}[U(pl)] \rangle - 1 \right| \sim O(\tilde{g}^2 N), \quad (4.2)$$

where $U(pl) = U_\mu(\mathbf{x})U_\nu(\mathbf{x} + \mu)U_\mu^+(\mathbf{x} + \nu)U_\nu^+(\mathbf{x})$ stands for the holonomy around an elementary plaquette in an arbitrary $\mu\nu$ -plane.

Next, the scaling (4.1) can be translated into the following (large N) constraint on the effective action $S(\{A_\rho(\mathbf{z})\})$ for the 'gauge fields' $A_\rho^{ab}(\mathbf{z})$. Recall that the latter can be composed of not only all possible gauge invariant operators but also necessarily contains gauge noninvariant counter-terms (responsible for the restoration of the Ward identities following from the manifest gauge symmetry of the lattice gauge theory). Employing the symbolic form (with $r(\{p\}) \in Y_n$ standing for the $S(n)$ irrep similarly to (1.20))

$$S(A) = \sum_{\{m\}} \sum_{n=2}^{+\infty} \sum_{r \in Y_n} \beta(r(\{p\}), \{m\}) \prod_{k=1}^n [\text{tr}((\partial)^{m_k} A^k)]^{p_k}, \quad (4.3)$$

eq. (4.1) translates into the proper scaling of the defining coefficients

$$\beta(r, \{m\}) \sim O([N^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{g}]^{-n+\gamma(r, \{m\})} N^{2-\sum_{k=1}^n p_k}) \quad , \quad \gamma(r, \{m\}) \geq 0, \quad (4.4)$$

where $A_\rho = 0$, $\forall \rho$, is supposed to be the global minimum (modulo (1.5) and gauge transformations) of the action (4.3). In the case when the quadratic gauge invariant combination is *not* unnaturally suppressed (i.e. $\gamma([2^1], 2) = 0$ but $\beta([2^1], 2) \neq 0$), the formal (large N) 'continuum' limit $A \rightarrow 0$ of the lagrangian $L(A)$ yields

$$\lim_{A \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0} L(A) \rightarrow \frac{c}{\tilde{g}^2} \text{tr}(F_{\mu\nu}^2) \quad ; \quad c > 0, \quad (4.5)$$

where $c \sim O([\tilde{g}^2]^0)$ is some constant. Remark that the localization (4.1) does *not* necessarily implies that in the large N WC limit $\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0$ the effective action (4.3) becomes quadratic in $F_{\mu\nu}^2$. The $A \rightarrow 0$ limit in eq. (4.5) may be omitted only when $\gamma(r, \{m\}) > 0$ for $\forall r \in Y_n$, $n \geq 3$.

Finally, in $D = 4$ the Renorm-Group analysis ensures the existence and *uniqueness* of the low-energy YM theory renormalizable in the Dyson's sense (which is reassured by asymptotic freedom). That is why one may expect that $D = 4$ lattice gauge theories (4.3) belong to the same universality class with the standard low-energy action $\int d^4x \text{tr}[F_{\mu\nu}^2(\mathbf{x})]/4g_{eff}^2$.

4.1 The $\{U_\rho \rightarrow \hat{1}\}$ localization.

In the particular case of gauge theories induced via (1.9) from the eigenvalue-systems (1.6), the required localization of $U_\rho(\mathbf{z})$ is predetermined by the localization (2.12) of the link-variables U_ρ in the reduced model (1.15). For definiteness, the effective 1-matrix system in the representation (1.19) of (1.15) is supposed to be restricted to (1.20). Let us demonstrate that the $\{U_\rho \rightarrow \hat{1}\}$ localization (2.12) holds true provided the saddle-point values $\lambda_i^{(0)} = N\bar{\lambda}_i^{(0)}$ in (1.20) approach 'infinity' according to the *scaling*-condition

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0} |\lambda_i^{(0)}| \sim O(N/[\tilde{g}N^{\frac{1}{2}}]) \iff |\bar{\lambda}_i^{(0)}| \sim O([\tilde{g}N^{\frac{1}{2}}]^{-1}), \quad (4.6)$$

with a functional $\tilde{g}(\{g_k\})$ approaching zero. To match with the localization (4.1), $\tilde{g}(\{g_k\})$ in the above equation should be the same as in (4.4).

To begin with, we sketch under what conditions on the (rescaled according to (3.17) coupling constants $b_{r(\{p\})}$ of the) effective model (1.20) the constraint (4.6) is dynamically fulfilled. As for the overall $O(N)$ -scaling of

$\{\lambda^{(0)}\}$, it has been demonstrated in Section 3. This scaling is further augmented in the WC domain when *all* the parameters tend to zero: $\{b_r \rightarrow 0\}$. In this case the large N limit of the discrete $U(N)$ model (3.20) coincides with the corresponding *hermitean* model in the *eigenvalue*-representation associated via substitution (3.17)

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\{b_r \rightarrow 0\}} \sum_{\{\lambda\}} e^{-S(\{\lambda\}|\{g_r\})} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \prod_{j=1}^N \frac{d\bar{\lambda}_j}{N^{-1}} \prod_{i < k} (\bar{\lambda}_i - \bar{\lambda}_k)^2 e^{-\tilde{S}(\{\bar{\lambda}\}|\{b_r\})}, \quad (4.7)$$

where $\tilde{S}(\{\bar{\lambda}\}|\{b_r\}) = S(\{N\bar{\lambda}\}|\{b_r N^{\gamma_r}\}) + 2 \sum_{i < k} \ln |\bar{\lambda}_i - \bar{\lambda}_k|$. One observes that the sums $\{\lambda\} \in [\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{N}}]^{\oplus N}$ over the *independent* integer-valued $\{\lambda\}$ -fields are transformed into the corresponding *integrals* over the real-valued variables $\bar{\lambda}_j \sim O(N^0)$. Complementary, in the WC domain the constraints (3.4) in eq. (3.15) are irrelevant and can be omitted.

Deferring the demonstration of these facts till the next subsection, we employ the *WC* representation (4.7) to clarify the mechanism of the residual $[\tilde{g}^2 N]^{-1/2}$ scaling of $|\bar{\lambda}_i^{(0)}|$ and relate the latter to the localization (2.12). In the simplest case of the $U(N)$ action (1.20) with $M_0 = 1$, one simply sets

$$\sum_{R(\{\lambda\})} |\dim R(\{\lambda\})|^q \exp[-g_{\tilde{r}_0} \sum_{i=1}^N (\lambda_i - \frac{N-1}{2})^2] \quad , \quad \tilde{g}^2/2 = g_{\tilde{r}_0} \quad , \quad (4.8)$$

where $g_{\tilde{r}_0} \sim O(1/N)$ and $\tilde{r}_0 = [2^1]$. Rescaling the eigenvalues $\bar{\lambda}_j = [\tilde{g} N^{\frac{1}{2}}]^{-1} h_j$ and separating in (4.8) the overall factor $[\tilde{g}^2 N]^{-\frac{qN(N-1)}{4}}$, we are left with the $\tilde{g}^2 N$ -*independent* theory of eigenvalues h_j that altogether ensures (4.6). In a general situation (3.17), similar arguments hold true provided that *all* b_r scale to zero as in (4.7). Choosing $b_{2k} = \liminf [b_r]$ as the smallest $b_{r(\{p\})}$ in the subset of $r \in Y_{2k}$ for each particular k , one is to equate $\tilde{g} N^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with the $\liminf [(b_{2k})^{\frac{1}{2k}}]$ selected among all $k \leq M_0$.

Now we are ready to make contact between the scaling (4.6) and the localization $\{U_\rho \rightarrow \hat{1}\}$ of eq. (2.12). Recall that, according to eq. (3.2), the irreps R in eq. (3.15) represent the irreps $\{R(\rho)\}$ entering the GLR fusion-rules (1.17). The latter ensure that the scaling-condition (4.6) is valid also for $\{\lambda^{(0)}(\mu\nu)\}$ parametrizing the SP irreps $\{R^{(0)}(\mu\nu)\}$ on which the large N sum (1.15), defining the reduced model, is localized (after integration over $\{U_\rho\}$). Combining it with (4.7), one concludes that the eigenvalues $\omega_j(\rho)$ of

$U_\rho = \Omega_\rho \text{diag}[e^{i\omega(\rho)}] \Omega_\rho^+$ are localized (modulo (1.16)) in the domain where $[S_r(\{U_\rho\}) - S_r(\{\hat{1}\})] \sim O(N^2[\tilde{g}^2 N]^0)$ when $\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0$. According to the Weyl character formula (2.9), for any particular j it results in the large N scaling complementary to (4.6)

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0} \langle \omega_j^2(\rho) \rangle \sim O(\tilde{g}^2 N) \mod [\mathbf{Z}_N]^D, \quad (4.9)$$

where $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ stands for (1.16). Alternatively, in terms of the quantum fluctuations $A_\rho^{ab} = -i \ln[U_\rho^{ab}]$ the condition (4.6) can be rewritten as

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0} \langle [A_\rho^{ab}]^2 \rangle \sim O(\tilde{g}^2) \mod [\mathbf{Z}_N]^D \quad (4.10)$$

for any given $a, b = 1, \dots, N$. Altogether, it justifies the required dynamical localization (2.12) in the reduced model (1.19)/(1.20) under the condition $\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0$.

Let us now return to the localization (4.2) in the gauge theories induced from the eigenvalue-systems (1.6) associated to the reduced models satisfying (4.10). The pattern of the mapping (1.9) (together with the saddle-point analysis of Section 2) suggests that the functionals $\tilde{g}(\{g_k\})$ in eqs. (4.1) and (4.10) are to be identified. To substantiate this identification, we consider the large N WC asymptotics $\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0$ of the properly normalized partition function (PF)

$$X_{L^D}^{(in)} = \int \prod_{\{\rho, \mathbf{z}\}} dU_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \exp[-S(\{U_\rho(\mathbf{z})\}) - S(\{\hat{1}\})] \quad (4.11)$$

for a (induced) gauge theory on a cubic lattice with L^D sites. As the construction (4.11) excludes the factor $e^{-S(\{\hat{1}\})}$ irrelevant for the contribution of the WC perturbative series, in the limit $\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0$ the PF $X_{L^D}^{(in)}$ yields the leading order of the large N ($\tilde{g}^2 N$)-expansion.

Consider a generic gauge theory (4.3) with the localization (4.2) imposed through the pattern (4.4). Then the WC asymptotics of (4.11) is predetermined by the $\tilde{g}^2 N$ -scaling law of the measure i.e. active Haar link-integrations remaining after a gauge fixing. This is simply because the exclusion of the $e^{-S(\{\hat{1}\})}$ -factor guarantees that the overall action $[S(\{U_\rho(\mathbf{z})\}) - S(\{\hat{1}\})]$ is $\sim O(N^2[\tilde{g}^2 N]^0)$ when $\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0$. As for the Haar measure scaling, consider first a cubic L^D lattice with the free boundary conditions for

$U_\rho(\mathbf{z})$. One observes that in the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ the maximal tree gauge in the average excludes at each site one link-integration out of the total amount D . The latter is clear if one imposes ('almost' complete when $L \rightarrow \infty$) temporal axial gauge keeping $U_D(\mathbf{z}) = \hat{1}$, $\forall \mathbf{z}$. Each remaining active Haar integration merges, in the vicinity of $\hat{1}$, with the 'flat' Lebesgue measure $\prod_{\rho=1}^{D-1} d^{N^2} A_\rho(\mathbf{z})$. Summarizing, for $L \rightarrow \infty$ the localization (4.1) results in the following large N WC asymptotics

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0} X_{L^D}^{(in)}(\tilde{g}) = [C \tilde{g} N^{\frac{1}{2}}]^{(D-1)N^2 L^D}, \quad C > 0, \quad (4.12)$$

where the $\int dU = 1$ normalization of the Haar measure is used, and C is a model dependent constant. Finally, one can demonstrate that the above pattern remains valid for a finite L provided the choice of the periodic boundary conditions for $U_\rho(\mathbf{z})$. In the specific case of the Wilsonian lattice action (where in eq. (4.4) $\gamma(n, m) = n - 2$ so that (4.12) results from a gaussian integration) the above asymptotics was derived in [13].

Summarizing, to justify the identification of the functionals $\tilde{g}(\{g_k\})$ in eqs. (4.1) and (4.10), one is to prove that eq. (4.15) holds true for the gauge theories induced from the reduced models constrained by (4.6). To begin with, according to the mapping (1.9), the factor $e^{-S(\{\hat{1}\})}$ can be rewritten as the partition function (PF) $\tilde{X}_{L^D}^{(a)}$ of the auxiliary model. The latter is to be computed in terms of the plaquette-factor (1.6) where the substitution

$$U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow \tilde{G}^+(\mathbf{z}) \tilde{G}(\mathbf{z} + \rho) \quad (4.13)$$

is performed. Consequently, the properly normalized PF of the induced gauge theory can be represented as the ratio

$$X_{L^D}^{(in)} = X_{L^D} / X_{L^D}^{(a)} \quad (4.14)$$

where X_{L^D} and $X_{L^D}^{(a)}$ are the PFs (both normalized akin to (4.11)) associated to the eigenvalue-system (1.6) and the auxiliary model defined through (4.13) respectively.

As for the large N limit of X_{L^D} , the correspondence (1.14) allows to express it as L^D th power of the PF X_r of the reduced model (1.15). In turn, the localization (4.10) results in the *power*-like asymptotics

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0} X_r(\{g_r\}) = [B \tilde{g} N^{\frac{1}{2}}]^{DN^2}, \quad B > 0, \quad (4.15)$$

which is deduced similarly to (4.12) (while $\int dU = 1$ is presumed). Complementary, one easily observes that the localization (2.12) in eigenvalue-system (1.6) predetermines that in the auxiliary model (4.13) the $SU(N)$ field $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{z})$ is localized (modulo (1.5)) in the vicinity of $\hat{1}$ as well. Consequently, akin to (4.15) one obtains

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow 0} X_{L^D}^{(a)}(\{g_r\}) = [\tilde{B} \tilde{g} N^{\frac{1}{2}}]^{L^D N^2} \quad , \quad \tilde{B} > 0 \quad . \quad (4.16)$$

Combining all the pieces together, we finally arrive at the required asymptotics (4.12) with $\tilde{g}(\{g_k\})$ being identical to the functional which enters the scaling (4.6) in the associated reduced model.

4.2 The auxiliary 'continuum' limits and $N \rightarrow \infty$ PTs.

The 1-matrix representation (3.15),(1.20) of the large N PF (1.17) allows, for the first time, to address analytically the $D > 2$ pattern of the phase transitions (PTs) in the $SU(N)$ gauge theories induced from the eigenvalue-systems (1.6). In particular, the asymptotics (4.12) of $X_{L^D}^{(in)}$ (and similar power-like asymptotics of $\tilde{X}_{L^D}^{(in)} \rightarrow (\tilde{X}_r)^{L^D}$) is characteristic of the phase naturally referred to as the weak-coupling (WC) one. The latter is associated to a connected vicinity of the WC domain $\{b_r \rightarrow 0\}$ of the parameters defining the effective 1-matrix system (1.20). On the other hand, the strong-coupling (SC) phase (associated to a connected vicinity of $\{b_r \rightarrow \infty\}$) can be shown to correspond to a completely different pattern of $\tilde{X}_{L^D}^{(in)}(\{g_k\})$. To take the simplest example, consider $D = 2$ (where the constraints (3.4) are trivial) and choose the simplest 1-matrix model (4.8) with $q = 2$. As it is known [12], the large N free energy of the latter model can be expanded in the SC series

$$- \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \ln[\tilde{X}_1(\tilde{b})] = N^2 \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{M(n)} f(n, m) \tilde{b}^{2m} \exp[-n\tilde{b}^2/2] \quad (4.17)$$

which reproduces the correct answer in a connected vicinity of $\tilde{b} = \tilde{g}^2 N \rightarrow \infty$.

The reason for the mismatch between the WC and SC large N patterns resides in the phase transition(s) which are ubiquitous [5, 10] in the lattice

gauge systems. As we will see, in the case of the induced gauge theories, it implies that the large N continuum limit (CL) encoded by (4.3)-(4.5) is accompanied by a few *auxiliary* 'continuum' limits in the effective 1-matrix system (3.15). The latter are characterized by the transformation of a few relevant discrete spaces into the corresponding continuum manifolds.

As previously, we concentrate on the simplest case when the 1-matrix model in (3.15) reduces to the selected family (1.20). The appropriate framework for our analysis is provided by the method based on the saddle-point equations (originally introduced in [11]) in a particular realization close to [4, 5]. First of all, let us demonstrate that in the large N limit the $SU(N)$ $D > 2$ constraints (3.4) in eq. (3.15) are irrelevant and can be omitted. The easiest way to see it is to notice first that for a selfdual $SU(N)$ irrep

$$n(R)|_{R=\bar{R}} = N(\lambda_1 - N + 1)/2 \quad (4.18)$$

so that, choosing $N \in 2(D-1)\mathbf{Z}_{>0}$, we satisfy (3.4) for $\forall\{\lambda\}$. Presuming the 'smoothness' of the large N limit, one arrives at the required conclusion. Actually, employing the 'regularized' Poisson resummation formula (3.13), the irrelevance of (3.4) in the $SU(N)$ models can be explicitly proven with the help of the formalism we now focus on to handle the effective 1-matrix system (1.20).

As we demonstrated in Section 3.2, the adjustment (3.17) of the $\{g_k\}$ -scaling is sufficient to ensure that the finite N sum (1.20) is accumulated by the configurations $\{\lambda_j\}$ possessing a 'smooth' large N limit *both* in the index j -space *and* in the 'base' $\{\lambda\} \in \mathbf{Z}^{\oplus N}$ -space. Then, in the computation of the leading $O(N^2)$ order of $-\ln(\tilde{X}_1)$ the large N sum (1.20) can be substituted by the corresponding 'path-integral'

$$\tilde{X}_1 = \int D\bar{\lambda}(t) \exp(-N^2 S_{eff}[\bar{\lambda}(t)]) \quad (4.19)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}(1 - \frac{i}{N}) \equiv \frac{\lambda_i}{N} = \bar{\lambda}_i \quad , \quad N^2 S_{eff}[\lambda(t)] \equiv S(\{\lambda\}), \quad (4.20)$$

over the '*continuum*' variables $\bar{\lambda}(t)$ evidently obeying the inequality [5] following from (3.6)

$$\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1} \rightarrow \frac{d\bar{\lambda}(t)}{dt} \geq 1 \quad , \quad t = (1 - i/N) \in [0, 1] \quad . \quad (4.21)$$

If the parameters $\{g_k\}$ are such that the solution $\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}(t)$ of the saddle-point equations

$$\frac{\delta S_{eff}[\bar{\lambda}(t)]}{\delta \bar{\lambda}(t)} = 0 \quad , \quad \bar{\lambda}^{SU(N)}(0) = 0 \quad , \quad (4.22)$$

fulfils $d\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}(t)/dt \geq 1$ for $\forall t \in [0, 1]$, the $U(N)$ pattern of (4.19) reduces to that of the large N *hermitean* model associated to (1.20) via the correspondence (4.7). As we will prove below, this reduction occurs in the WC phase when the set $\{g_r\} \cong \{b_r\}$ belongs to a connected vicinity of $\{b_r \rightarrow 0\}$. In the corresponding hermitean model, the $1/N$ quasiclassical expansion is organized in the background of the saddle-point solution(s) $\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}(t)$. Since $S(\{\lambda\}) \sim O(N^2)$, the quantum fluctuations of the continuum $\lambda(t)$ -variables can be neglected in the large N limit

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_1 = \exp(-N^2 S_{eff}[\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}(t)]) \quad (4.23)$$

and the *leading* order of the semiclassical and that of the $1/N$ expansions *coincide*. Remark that, in the case associated to the $SU(N)$ system, we are to impose the additional 'boundary' condition (4.22). The latter matches with the translational invariance $\lambda_i \rightarrow \lambda_i + m$ which must be present in the ($\mathbf{Z}_2$ -invariant) $SU(N)$ action $S(\{\lambda^{SU(N)}\})$ defined by eq. (1.20).

One can show that the $SU(N)$ solution of (4.22),(1.20) does exists (provided the subset $\{g_r, r \in Y_{2M_0}\}$ has the signs consistent with the convergence of the $\{\lambda\}$ -series), being unique and $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -invariant. In the $U(N)$ -case the above m -translations (of λ_i) generate the 'quasizero' mode (to be factorized out in the analysis of the $O(N^2)$ -order of $-\ln[\tilde{X}_1]$). In effect, it suffices to retain the (unique) $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -invariant $U(N)$ solution which satisfies

$$h^{(0)}(t) = -h^{(0)}(1-t) \quad , \quad h(t) = \bar{\lambda}(t) - 1/2 \quad , \quad (4.24)$$

in terms of the shifted function $h(t)$. The explicit construction is easier to perform reformulating (1.20) in terms of the spectral density associated to $h^{(0)}(t)$

$$0 \leq \rho(\eta) = \int_0^1 dt \delta(\eta - h^{(0)}(t)) = (dt/dh^{(0)}(t))|_{h^{(0)}(t)=\eta} \leq 1 \quad , \quad (4.25)$$

constrained by $\int d\eta \rho(\eta) = 1$. Remark that, in the case corresponding to the $SU(N)$ model (1.20), one is to impose additionally that $\rho^{SU(N)}(\eta) = 0$

if $\forall \eta < -1/2$ to match with the condition (4.22). Note also that condition (4.21) results in the constraint $\rho(\eta) \in [0, 1]$.

To take the simplest example, consider the $U(N)$ subvariety of (1.20) when the factor in the exponent $e^{-V(R)}$ can be rewritten in terms of $h(t)$ in the 'local' form

$$\frac{V(R(\{\lambda\}))}{N^2} = \int dt V(h(t)) \quad , \quad V(\eta) = \sum_{m=1}^{M_0} \frac{[\tilde{b}_{2m} \eta]^{2m}}{2m} \quad , \quad (4.26)$$

corresponding to $p_{2k} = 1$, $p_{2k-1} = 1$, $1 \leq k \leq M_0$. In this case, the SP equation for $\rho(\eta)$ reads

$$\frac{1}{q} \frac{dV(\eta)}{d\eta} = P \int d\phi \frac{\rho(\phi)}{\eta - \phi} \quad , \quad \rho(\phi) = \rho(-\phi), \quad (4.27)$$

where P stands for the principle value of the integral over ϕ , and the additional reflection-invariance condition selects the solution associated to a selfdual SP irrep $R^{(0)} = \bar{R}^{(0)}$. There exists a standard algorithm to solve (4.27) for an arbitrary potential (4.26). It can be found e.g. in the third reference of [4] and will not be reviewed here. We note only that, in the case of the simplest $M_0 = 1$ $U(N)$ model (4.8), the solution $\rho(\eta)$ of (4.27) assumes the pattern of the Wigner semicircle law

$$\rho(\eta) = \frac{\tilde{b}^2}{q\pi} \sqrt{\frac{2q}{\tilde{b}^2} - \eta^2} \quad , \quad \tilde{b} \equiv \tilde{b}_2 \quad , \quad (4.28)$$

which allows to reproduce the original discrete sum (1.20) for $(2\tilde{b}^2/q) < \pi^2$ (when $\rho(\eta) < 1$ in the whole admissible domain of $\eta^2 \leq 2q/\tilde{b}^2$).

Next, in the domain of $\{g_r\}$ where $d\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}(t)/dt < 1$ in a set of 'windows' $t \in \cup_k [\tilde{t}_{a(k)}, \tilde{t}_{b(k)}]$, the above strategy has to be refined. To be more specific, consider again the simplest $M_0 = 1$ $U(N)$ model (4.8) (analysed at length in [5]). When $\tilde{b}^2 > \tilde{b}_{cr}^2 = q\pi^2/2$, the solution $\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}(t)$ is located partially outside the admissible domain (4.21) as it is clear from (4.28). To reproduce the original discrete model (4.8) with $\tilde{b}^2 > \tilde{b}_{cr}^2$, in (4.23) one is to substitute $\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}(t)$ by the 'closest' *boundary* configuration $\bar{\zeta}^{(0)}(t)$. The latter is to be found presuming that

$$\frac{\bar{\zeta}^{(0)}(t)}{dt} = 1 \quad , \quad t \in [t_1, t_2] \quad , \quad (4.29)$$

where the $[\mathbf{Z}_2]$ -sefduality prescribes that $-t_1 + 1/2 = t_2 - 1/2$. The choice (4.29) implies simply that, for the indices j corresponding to the window $[t_1, t_2]$, the number n_j of boxes in the associated j th rows of $Y_n^{(N)}$ (constrained by $n_i \geq n_{i+1}$) assumes the 'boundary' values $n_i = n_{i+1} = \dots = n_{N-i} = 0$. After substitution of (4.29) into the effective action (4.20), one obtains a (modified compared with (4.22)) saddle-point equations for $\bar{\zeta}^{(0)}(t)$ in the remaining domain $t \in [0, t_1] \cup [t_2, 1]$.

Practical computations are easier to perform translating the above construction in terms of the spectral density (4.25) to be deformed $\rho(\eta) \rightarrow 1$ on the interval $\eta \in [\eta_1, \eta_2]$ corresponding to (4.29). The 'turning on' (4.29) of the constraint (4.21) (being a nonanalytical procedure) results in the third order phase transition [5]. Note also that in the $M_0 > 1$ case of (1.20) there may be multicritical pattern with a few phase transitions associated to opening or closing of a new 'window' $[t_{a(l)}, t_{b(l)}]$ (see e.g. the third ref. in [4]).

Next, the above picture of PTs allows to reinterpret the mismatch between the large N WC and SC patterns of the partition function $\tilde{X}_{LD}$ (eqs. (4.12) and (4.17) respectively) from the viewpoint of the auxiliary continuum limits. To begin with, according to the identification (4.21) the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit of the discrete index-space $\{i = 1, \dots, N\}$ is the continuum 'time'-manifold t . Outside the WC domain, the large N system (4.19) still retains the remnant of the discreteness (associated to the base $\mathbf{Z}^{\oplus N}$ -space) which is encoded in the constraint (4.21). The subtlety is that the latter constraint is relevant despite the fact that each particular large N sum over a given j -species $\lambda_j \in \mathbf{Z}$ merges with the integral over the real-valued variable. Finally, let us show that in the WC limit $\{b_r \rightarrow 0\}$ the solution $\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}(t)$ doesn't violate condition (4.21). In other words, all the involved discrete spaces merge with the associated continuum manifolds which, in particular, implies the validity of the large N reduction (4.7) of (1.20) in the whole $N \rightarrow \infty$ WC phase. Indeed, the substitution (4.7) can be justified by going over to the effective theory of the $\chi_j = [\tilde{g}N^{\frac{1}{2}}]\bar{\lambda}_j$ fields. Having adjusted the proper scaling (3.17), (4.6) (i.e. $\tilde{g}^2 N$ -independence of the large N χ_j -system in the WC limit), one obtains

$$d\bar{\lambda}(t)/dt = [\tilde{g}N^{\frac{1}{2}}]^{-1} d\chi(t)/dt \sim O(1/[\tilde{g}N^{\frac{1}{2}}]) \gg 1 \quad (4.30)$$

which substantiates the WC equivalence of (1.20) with the associated her-

mitean model.

In conclusion, it takes a minor modification of the above analysis to retain explicitly the $D > 2$ $SU(N)$ constraints (3.4) built into the effective 1-matrix model (1.19). Employing the representation (3.15) of the latter, one can demonstrate that the free energy $N^2 F_{eff}(p, \bar{p})$ (evaluated prior to the sum over $p, \bar{p} \in \mathbf{Z}$) assumes the form

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} e^{-N^2 [F_{eff}(p, \bar{p}) - F_{eff}(0, 0)]} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} e^{-\varepsilon p^2} \delta_{\bar{p}, 0} \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} \delta_{p, [D-1]k} . \quad (4.31)$$

As a result, the localization $\{\bar{p} = 0; p = 0 \bmod [D-1]\mathbf{Z}\}$ proves that the constraints (3.4) can be safely omitted in (1.19), (3.15) when $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Summarizing, the large N continuum limit (CL) in the proposed induced lattice gauge theories is accompanied by the two auxiliary 'CLs'. The latter, being predetermined (in the reduced system (3.15)) by the correspondence (3.19) and the scaling (4.6), are associated to the $N \rightarrow \infty$ transformation of the discrete j -index space and $\{\lambda\} \in \mathbf{Z}^{\oplus N}$ space into the corresponding continuum manifolds. In turn, it foreshadows the irrelevance of the $D > 2$ constraint (3.4) in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. Together with the large N reduction (1.14), it results in the substantial simplification of the large N WC analysis. As for the physical interpretation of the discussed phase pattern, it can be understood relating the large N PTs to the issue of the validity of the WC and the SC expansions in the associated WC $\{b_r \rightarrow 0\}$ and the SC $\{b_r \rightarrow \infty\}$ domains respectively. We expect also that, among the phase transitions (passing from the WC to the SC limits), there is one associated to the condensation of the *microscopic* lattice monopoles which are always present in the lattice gauge theories.

5 Remarks about the D=2 case.

To begin with, consider the $D = 2$ large N average of some nonself-intersecting Wilson loop (1.7) for which a closed expression can be derived. The appropriate method is a minor modification of the combinatorial approach due to Migdal [9] (see also [4, 8]) developed in the context of the ordinary $2d$ gauge theories.

Owing to the periodic boundary conditions the $2d$ L^2 -plane in question is made, topologically, into a discretized 2-tora. Let $L \rightarrow \infty$ so that any finite-size loop C does not coincide with one of the two uncontractible cycles defining the tora. Consequently, cutting along the contour C , this tora is decomposed into the two disjoint connected components: a disk with area A and the complementary disk with one handle of the area $L^2 - A$. To apply cutting-gluing technique, first one is to introduce (as in [8]) the so-called 'disc-amplitudes' $Z_G(\tilde{A}, L_C | \{U(\mathbf{z}_k)\})$. The latter is defined as the partition function of the $D = 2$ eigenvalue-theory (1.6) on a disk of the area $\tilde{A}$ with a given number of handles G . The boundary-contour C is supposed to consist of L_C ρ_k -links, each being endowed with a *free* boundary conditions introduced via the associated link-variables $U_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k)$, $k = 1, \dots, L_C$.

A particular term of each defining factor (1.6), being referred to a $\mu\nu$ -plaquette based at $\mathbf{z}$, assigns to this plaquette one of the $SU(N)$ irreps $R_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{z}) \equiv R(\mathbf{z})$. The specifics in the computation of the $2d$ disc-amplitudes is that $Z_G(A, L_C | \{U(\mathbf{z}_k)\})$ can be evaluated with the help of the orthonormality condition for the Lie group characters

$$L_{R_1|R_2}^{(2)} = \int dV \chi_{R_1}(V) \chi_{R_2}(V^+) = \delta_{R_1, R_2}, \quad (5.1)$$

corresponding to the simplest GLR coefficient of the second order while the higher order $L_{R_+|\{R_k\}}^{(p)}$, $p \geq 3$, are *not* involved. Given the amplitude associated to a particular connected base-surface, eq. (5.1) prescribes that $R_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{z})$ is $\mathbf{z}$ -*independent*. As a result, thus introduced disk-amplitude is readily computed in the G -*independent* form

$$Z_G(A | \{U(\mathbf{z}_k)\}) = \sum_R e^{-S(R)A} \prod_{\{\mathbf{z}_k \in C\}} \chi_R(U_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k)) \quad (5.2)$$

where $\{\mathbf{z}_k\}$ stands for the set of L_C sites on the boundary C . As a cross-check, the $D = 2$ partition function $\tilde{X}_{L^2}$ can be easily rewritten in terms of $Z_G(A_q | \{U(\mathbf{z}_k)\})$ (where $A_1 = A$, $A_2 = L^2 - A$)

$$\tilde{X}_{L^2} = \int \prod_{\{\mathbf{z}_k\}} dU_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k) Z_0(A_1 | \{U^+(\mathbf{z}_k)\}) Z_1(A_2 | \{U(\mathbf{z}_k)\}) \quad (5.3)$$

which, owing to (5.2) and (2.5), results in

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_{L^2} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_R e^{-S(R)L^2} = \left[\sum_R e^{-\frac{S(R)}{2}} \right]^{2L^2} \quad (5.4)$$

that matches with the $D = 2$ case of (1.17) according to (5.1). Remark that the same expression comes out in the case of the L^2 -surface of an *arbitrary* genus G .

Next, similarly to the ordinary $2d$ lattice gauge theories, the Wilson loop average in the $2d$ system (1.6) reads

$$\langle W_C^{R_0} \rangle = \int \prod_{\{\mathbf{z}_k\}} dU_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k) Z_0(A_1 | \{U^+(\mathbf{z}_k)\}) Z_1(A_2 | \{U(\mathbf{z}_k)\}) \frac{\chi_{R_0}(U_C)}{\tilde{X}_{L^2}}, \quad (5.5)$$

where $U_C = \prod_{\{\mathbf{z}_k\}} U_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k)$, R_0 is the representation of the holonomy. Evaluating (5.5) one is to take advantage of the fact that $Z_G(A | \{U(\mathbf{z}_k)\})$ is independent of the 'angular' variables $\Omega(\mathbf{z}_k)$. Equivalently, it can be represented as the invariance of $Z_G(\tilde{A} | \{U(\mathbf{z}_k)\})$ with respect to the $[U(N)]^{\oplus L_C}$ conjugations

$$U_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k) \rightarrow V_{\rho_k}^+(\mathbf{z}_k) U_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k) V_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k) \quad , \quad V_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k) \in U(N) \quad , \quad (5.6)$$

(where $k = 1, \dots, L_C$) inherited from the symmetry (1.3) of the factor (1.6). Let us perform the substitution (5.6) as a change of the variables in eq. (5.5) that leaves the measure invariant. Integrating over $V_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k)$ with the Haar measure and employing the identity

$$\int \prod_{\{\mathbf{z}_p\}} dV(\mathbf{z}_p) \chi_{R_0}(\prod_{\{\mathbf{z}_k\}} V^+(\mathbf{z}_k) U_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k) V(\mathbf{z}_k)) = \frac{\prod_{\{\mathbf{z}_k\}} \chi_{R_0}(U_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k))}{[dim R_0]^{L_C - 1}}, \quad (5.7)$$

one trades the factor $\chi_{R_0}(\prod_{\{\mathbf{z}_k\}} U_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k))$ for the properly normalized product of the characters (akin to (1.2)). At the same time, the rest of the integrated in (5.5) expression is left intact. Remark that in eq. (5.7) the $[dim R_0]^{1-L_C}$ normalization can be deduced making the particular choice of the arguments: $U_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_k) = \hat{1}$, $\forall k$.

After $\{dV(\mathbf{z}_p)\}$ integrations, a generic loop average (1.7) in the eigenvalue systems can be expressed in terms of the GRL coefficients (2.2). For a nonself-intersecting contour C one obtains

$$\langle W_C^{R_0} \rangle = \frac{1}{\tilde{X}_{L^2}} \sum_{R_1, R_2} e^{-S(R_1)A - S(R_2)(L^2 - A)} \frac{[L_{R_1|R_2, R_0}]^{L_C}}{[dim R_0]^{L_C - 1}} \quad (5.8)$$

which complements the GLR pattern of the partition function. Observe that the same GLR pattern (1.8) of $\langle W_C^f \rangle$ immediately follows from (5.7) in *any* $D \geq 2$. Finally, $\langle W_C^{R_0} \rangle$ can be rewritten in a more conventional form of the average

$$\langle W_C^{R_0} \rangle = \frac{1}{\tilde{X}_{L^2}} \sum_R e^{-L^2 S(R)} B_{L_C}(R|R_0, A) \equiv \langle B_{L_C}(R|R_0, A) \rangle_R \quad (5.9)$$

performed with the weight $e^{-L^2 S(R)}$, and we have introduced

$$B_{L_C}(R|R_0, A) = \sum_{R_1} e^{-[S(R_1) - S(R)]A} \frac{[L_{R_1|R, R_0}]^{L_C}}{[\dim R_0]^{L_C - 1}}. \quad (5.10)$$

Remark that eqs. (5.9), (5.10) remain valid in the case of a generic nonself-intersecting contour C on a discretized $2d$ surface of an *arbitrary* genus (provided C is not homotopic to any of defining uncontractible cycles).

Building on the results of [14] (obtained in the context of the continuum YM_2 on a $2d$ sphere), one can derive the integral representation for (5.9) in terms of the associated spectral density (4.25). For simplicity, we consider the option when $e^{-S(R)}$ belongs to the $U(N)$ subvariety (4.26) of the family (1.20). Also, we restrict our attention to the segment of the WC domain of $\{g_r\} \cong \{b_r\}$ where the spectral density is less than $1/2$ for all admissible η . Then, as it is demonstrated in Appendix B, the large N average $\langle W_C^f \rangle$ of a nonself-intersecting loop C in the fundamental representation assumes the form

$$\langle W_C^f \rangle = N^{2-L_C} \int d\eta \, \rho(\eta) \left(\frac{\sin(\pi \rho(\eta))}{\pi \rho(\eta)} \right)^{qA}, \quad (5.11)$$

where $\rho(\eta) < 1/2$ is the $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -invariant solution of the SP eq. (4.27). We postpone the interpretation of the unconventional N^{2-L_C} -scaling of the average (5.11) till the next section and now turn to the issue of the continuum limit (CL).

5.1 Identification of the universality class.

To study the CL of (5.11) directly, one is to send L^2, A to infinity keeping A/L^2 finite. Simultaneously, the coupling constant $\tilde{b}^2 = g_r^2 N$ (entering

(4.6)) should approach the critical value $\tilde{b}^2 = 0$ (corresponding to the localization (2.12)). It is to be performed in accordance with such scaling-law which ensures a *finite* physical string tension σ as $\tilde{b}^2 \rightarrow 0$. Let the total area of the closed $2d$ surface in question, being measured in the units of σ^{-1} , is adjusted to be finite as well. Take the $G = 0$ case, the $2d$ sphere, where the free energy of *continuum* YM_2 is $\sim O(N^2)$. Then thus defined $\tilde{b}^2 \rightarrow 0$ limit of the (area-dependent part of) the $G = 0$ amplitude (5.11) is to be compared with its continuum counterpart. The latter can be directly computed with the help of the *self-reproducing* lattice theory [9, 8] defined via the plaquette-factor (1.1) with

$$e^{-F(R)} = \dim R \exp[-f(\{C_k(R)\})] . \quad (5.12)$$

Here $f(\{C_k(R)\})$ is some function of the Casimir operators $C_k(R)$, $k = 1, \dots, N$, which parametrizes a particular *generalized* YM_2 [8]. Note that the $q = 1$ case of the family (1.20) represents the polynomial subvariety of (5.12) for the particular choice of $U = \hat{1}$.

The identification of $f(\{C_k(R)\})$, corresponding to a given eigenvalue-system (1.6), would determine the universality class to which the associated induced lattice gauge theory belongs. Instead of addressing this question directly, we will find a lattice gauge theory (1.1) which is supposed to have the same CL (in a finite physical 2-volume) as the model (1.6) in question. For this purpose, in the infinite lattice-volume limit $L^2, A \rightarrow \infty$ we identify the pairs of the large N gauge- and eigenvalue-systems for which the large A loop-averages are the same for generic values of the relevant coupling constant(s) $\{b_r\}$.

To begin with, from the results of [4, 8], one readily deduces for the disc-amplitude associated to (1.1)

$$\tilde{Z}_G(A|U_C) = \sum_R (\dim R)^{1-2G} e^{-K(R)A} \chi_R(U_C) , \quad (5.13)$$

where $K(R) = F(R) + \ln(\dim R)$. To make a crosscheck, one observes that for the Heat-Kernal action (1.1) (with $f(\{C_k(R)\}) \sim C_2(R)$) eq. (5.13) reproduces the canonical expression derived in [4, 8]. Compared to the pattern (5.2), the above formula contains the topological piece $(\dim R)^{1-2G}$ (which is A -independent) and depends on the eigenvalues of the single holonomy U_C .

As a result, the large N partition function $\tilde{X}_{L^2}^{(G)}$ on a discretized surface of genus G assumes the form

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_R (\dim R)^{2-2G} e^{-K(R)L^2} = \left[\sum_R (\dim R)^{\frac{2-2G}{2L^2}} e^{-\frac{K(R)}{2}} \right]^{2L^2}, \quad (5.14)$$

where the weight $K(R)$ is supposed to be consistent with the $O(N^2)$ -scaling of $\ln[\tilde{X}_{L^2}^{(G)}]$. To be more specific, in what follows we concentrate on the case when $e^{-F(R)}$ in eq. (1.1) is restricted to the family (1.20). For a preliminary determination of the pairing, one observes that the pattern (5.14) precisely matches with that of eq. (5.4) provided the identification

$$F(R) + \ln(\dim R) \equiv K(R) = S(R), \quad L^2 \rightarrow \infty, \quad \forall G, \quad (5.15)$$

complemented by the infinite lattice-volume limit. To ensure that the free energy (in both (1.1) and in the associated via (5.15) eigenvalue-system (1.6)) is $\sim O(N^2)$, one is to require that the pattern (1.20) of $e^{-F(R)}$ satisfies $q > \max[(1 - (2 - 2G)/2L^2); 1]$. Note also that, in the $G = 1$ case of the 2-tora, the matching (5.15) accidentally holds true for any finite L^2 as well.

Next, consider an arbitrary nonself-intersecting loop C of the area A on a generic discretized $2d$ surface of genus G with the total area L^2 . For simplicity, we restrict our attention to the case when, after cutting along the contour C , the disc of the area A has *zero* number of handles. Employing [4, 8], one derives

$$\langle W_C^{R_0} \rangle = \frac{1}{\tilde{X}_{L^2}^{(G)}} \sum_R (\dim R)^{2-2G} e^{-L^2 K(R)} \tilde{B}(R|R_0, A), \quad (5.16)$$

$$\tilde{B}(R|R_0, A) = \sum_{R_1} \frac{\dim R_1}{\dim R} e^{-[K(R_1) - K(R)]A} L_{R_1|R, R_0}. \quad (5.17)$$

To simplify the comparison with (5.9), in what follows R_0 is selected to be the fundamental irrep f . According to the representation theory [6], it substantially reduces the pattern of the GLR fusion rules

$$\{L_{R_1|R, f} = 1 \text{ or } 0\} \implies (L_{R_1|R, f})^{L_C} = L_{R_1|R, f} \quad (5.18)$$

which makes the relevant analysis particularly transparent. Combining (5.18) with the identification (5.15), one observes that the peculiar 'renormalization' of the perimeter-law by the factor $(\dim f)^{1-L_C} = N^{1-L_C}$ is the only

difference between (5.9) and (5.16) in the limit $L^2, A \rightarrow \infty$. More precisely, denote the effective actions in the integral representation (akin to eq. (5.11)) for the loop-average

$$\langle W_C^f \rangle = N^{H_k(L_C)} \int dh e^{-B_{eff}^{(k)}(h|A, \{b_r\})} \quad (5.19)$$

by $B_{eff}^{(k)}(h|A, \{b_r\})$ where $k = 1, 2$ stand for the options (5.9) and (5.16) respectively, and $H_1(L) = 2 - L$, $H_2(L) = 1$. According to the explicit form (1.20) of $e^{-S(R)} = e^{-K(R)}$, the large A limit $\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} S_{eff}^{(k)}(h|A, \{b_r\})$ is k -independent for generic values of $\{b_r\}$. To be more specific, consider the continuum limit $\tilde{b}^2 \rightarrow 0$ and take the $M_0 = 1$ $U(N)$ model (4.8). In the limit $\tilde{b}^2 \rightarrow \infty$ the spectral density (4.28) tends to zero: $\rho(\eta) \sim O(\tilde{b})$. As it is clear from Appendix B, this scaling of $\rho(\eta)$ implies that $[dim R_1 / dim R] \rightarrow 1 + O(\tilde{b}^2)$ (for admissible $\eta^2 < 2q/\tilde{b}^2$ and the characteristic values of R). In other words, the $[dim R_1 / dim R]$ -dependent mismatch between (5.10) and (5.17) is expected to be irrelevant in the continuum limit.

Upon a reflection, the above correspondence between (5.9) and (5.16) suggests the following equivalence. The gauge system (on a sphere of a *finite* physical 2-volume) induced from (1.6) and the associated ordinary gauge theory (1.1) in $D = 2$ have one and the same continuum limit (CL) provided the identification (5.15). To justify the general consistency of this statement, we observe first that once the localization (2.12) takes place in the $2d$ system (1.6) then similar localization (with the same scaling) is valid in (1.1) associated via (5.15). The converse statement is also true. This correspondence between the localizations follows from the specific relation (5.15) between the pair of the weights $e^{-F(R)}$ and $e^{-S(R)}$. To make it manifest, one simply needs to change the variables going over from λ_j - to the $\chi_j = ([\tilde{g}N^{\frac{1}{2}}]\lambda_j/N)$ -fields like in eq. (4.30).

Next, the localization in the ordinary $D = 2$ lattice gauge theory indeed implies that the latter theory approaches the continuum. It is predetermined by the absence of the propagating degrees of freedom in the $2d$ gauge systems so that the renorm-group anomalous dimensions vanish. To see how it works, introduce the infinitesimal lattice spacing a and some *finite* parameter $\kappa \sim \sqrt{\sigma}$ responsible for the physical mass-scale. Then, given the localization-pattern (4.4) of the lattice action (4.3), the judiciously adjusted scaling

$$A_\rho = B_\rho a \quad , \quad \tilde{b} = \kappa a \quad ; \quad \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \tilde{b}^2 L^2 = const \quad , \quad (5.20)$$

in the limit $a \rightarrow 0$ is supposed to directly provide with the pattern of the continuum gauge action associated to the corresponding low-energy theory of (1.1).

Finally, the equivalence of the CL in (1.6) and (1.1) is tantamount to the equivalence of the effective theories for the low-frequency modes of B_ρ . The perimeter-type L_C -dependent terms, among other things, are responsible for the details of the *short*-distance attachment of the colour-electric flux to the external Wilson loop source. As such, they may be sensitive to the details of the discretization (of both the space-time and the action) that in our case is reflected by the mismatch in $H_k(L_C)$ of eq. (5.19). On the contrary, in the CL limit (5.20) (keeping A/L^2 finite), the bulk $(\tilde{b}^2 L^2), (\tilde{b}^2 A)$ -dependent terms in both (5.9) and (5.16) are supposed to be low-energy quantities insensitive to the lattice discretization.

Formally, one could consider instead of a single loop average the so-called Creutz ratios (see e.g. [13]) of the products of the averages

$$\frac{\langle W_{C_1}^f \rangle \langle W_{C_2}^f \rangle}{\langle W_{C_3}^f \rangle \langle W_{C_4}^f \rangle} \quad , \quad L_+ = L_{C_1} + L_{C_2} = L_{C_3} + L_{C_4}, \quad (5.21)$$

where the pairs of the contours $\{C_1, C_2\}$ and $\{C_3, C_4\}$ are constrained to have the same overall perimeter L_+ . Being originally designed to cancel exactly the short-distance perimeter-type contributions, the ratios are evidently insensitive to the difference in $H_k(L_C)$ of eq. (5.19). Altogether, the above general arguments are consistent with the presumable equivalence of the universality class to which the latter pairs of the ordinary and the induced $2d$ gauge theories belong. Note also that, in the case of a generic irrep R_0 , the mismatch between the patterns (5.9) and (5.16) includes additionally the perimeter-type contribution owing to the different powers of $L_{R_1|R, R_0}$. As it is clear from the above discussion, this piece of the answer is irrelevant for the determination of the universality class (even for a finite N) which is consistent with the previous consideration based on the identification (5.15).

6 The large N pattern of the loop-averages.

Building on the readily computable case of the $D = 2$ eigenvalue-systems (1.6), let us now discuss the general pattern of the large N scaling including

self-intersecting contours and multi-loop averages. We will argue in particular that, in the gauge theories induced from (1.6), the standard large N factorization takes place. The scaling of a generic irreducible interaction between a number of Wilson contours is also considered. In conclusion, we comment on peculiar reasons behind the unconventional $N \rightarrow \infty$ scaling (5.11)

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle W_C^f \rangle \sim O(N^{2-L_C}) \quad (6.1)$$

of the average of a single nonself-intersecting loop (1.7).

It is instructive to begin with the pattern of the irreducible interactions between a given number of nonintersecting, nonself-intersecting Wilson loops C_p , $p = 1, \dots, B$, on a particular $2d$ discretized surface of the area L^2 . As usual, the corresponding amplitudes are defined by the irreducible correlators of B th order

$$\langle\langle \prod_{p=1}^B W_{C_p}^f \rangle\rangle = \langle \prod_{p=1}^B W_{C_p}^f \rangle - \prod_{p=1}^B \langle W_{C_p}^f \rangle - \dots \quad (6.2)$$

They are deduced from the ordinary B -loop correlators $\langle \prod_{p=1}^B W_{C_p}^f \rangle$ via subtraction of all lower order reducible contributions as prescribed by the standard cluster expansion. One may presume that the pattern (4.3),(4.4) is universal for a wide class of the lattice gauge theories (and in particular for the family (1.1) with $e^{-F(R)}$ given by (1.20)) with the free energy $\sim O(N^2)$. Then, provided the *absence* of 'unnatural' cancellation between individual diagrams, the 't Hooft double-line representation (for the large N WC series) yields the topological expansion in the form

$$\langle\langle \prod_{p=1}^B W_{C_p}^f \rangle\rangle = \sum_{H \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}} w(B, H) N^{2-2H-B}, \quad (6.3)$$

where $w(B, H) \sim O(N^0)$ and H denotes the genus of the abstract surface in the *index*-space. The same pattern is supposed to arise in the context of the large N strong coupling expansion on a lattice.

To deduce the large N pattern of $\langle\langle \prod_{p=1}^B W_{C_p}^f \rangle\rangle$ in the induced gauge theories, I propose to compare the *finite* N averages $\langle \prod_{p=1}^B W_{C_p}^f \rangle$ in the ordinary $2d$ gauge system (1.1) and in the eigenvalue-model (1.6) associated via (5.15). To this aim, one is to employ the cutting-gluing technique

[9, 8] already used in the previous subsection. For simplicity, we assume additionally that (nonself-intersecting) C_p are not homotopic to the defining uncontractible cycles of the surface on which both of the associated systems are defined. In this case, the conventional pattern (6.3) gets modified (as it will be clear in the continuum limit) by the perimeter-type factors

$$\langle\langle \prod_{p=1}^B W_{C_p}^f \rangle\rangle = \left(\prod_{p=1}^B N^{1-L_{C_p}} \right) \sum_{H \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}} \tilde{w}(B, H) N^{2-2H-B}, \quad (6.4)$$

with $\tilde{w}(B, H) \sim O(N^0)$.

To demonstrate (6.4), we first cut the surface along the set $\{C_p\}$ of the contours that results in a set of disjoint $2d$ windows. Let the q th window have the area A_q being endowed with certain number B_q of boundary discs and that G_q of handles. Similarly to the simplest $B = 1$ case (5.2), one evaluates the corresponding B_q -disc amplitude

$$Z_{G_q}^{B_q}(A_q | \{U(\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\mathbf{p})})\}) = \sum_R e^{-S(R)A_q} \prod_{p=1}^{B_q} \prod_{\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\mathbf{p})} \in C_p} \chi_R(U_{\rho_k}(\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\mathbf{p})})) . \quad (6.5)$$

This expression is to be confronted with the corresponding B -disc amplitude in the ordinary $2d$ gauge theory

$$\tilde{Z}_{G_q}^{B_q}(A_q | \{U_{C_p}\}) = \sum_R (\dim R)^{2-2G_q-B_q} e^{-K(R)A_q} \prod_{p=1}^{B_q} \chi_R(U_{C_p}), \quad (6.6)$$

where $K(R)$ is defined by eq. (5.15).

By the same token as in eq. (5.5), the B -loop correlator $\langle \prod_{p=1}^B W_{C_p}^f \rangle$ is to be composed from the associated amplitudes (6.5) (or (6.6) respectively) performing the remaining Haar integrations over $\{U(\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\mathbf{p})})\}$. Apparently, this procedure can be visualized then as gluing the above windows back so that their boundaries sandwich properly the loops $W_{C_p}^f$ involved. Thus, the only difference between the ordinary $2d$ gauge theory and the associated $2d$ eigenvalue-system is in the mismatch between the patterns of the multi-disc factors (6.5) and (6.6). The most transparent situation arises in the continuum limit (5.20) when all ratios A_q/L^2 are kept finite. A minor modification of the arguments (see Section 5.1) suggests that, in this limit, the

identification (5.15) ensures the proportionality of the *finite* N averages

$$< \prod_{p=1}^B W_{C_p}^f >_{\text{eig.}} \longrightarrow \left(\prod_{p=1}^B N^{1-L_{C_p}} \right) < \prod_{p=1}^B W_{C_p}^f >_{\text{gauge}} \quad (6.7)$$

evaluated in terms of the associated multi-disc amplitudes (6.5) and (6.6) respectively. Presuming the 'smoothness' of the continuum limit, one may expect that (6.4) remains valid for generic values of A_q and the coupling constants. In particular it implies that in the eigenvalue-systems, despite the unconventional perimeter-dependence (6.1), the large N factorization of the loop-correlators remains present.

Turning to the average associated to a single self-intersecting contour, we first consider self-intersections on a finite number of *sites*. The simplest example is the eight-figure loop ('two-leaf flower') $C^{(2)} = C_1(\mathbf{x}_0) \cup C_2(\mathbf{x}_0)$ composed of the two nonself-intersecting contours $C_k(\mathbf{x}_0)$, $k = 1, 2$, which share the single site $\mathbf{x}_0$ in common. Similarly, one constructs a contour $C^{(m)} = \cup_{k=1}^m C_k(\mathbf{x}_0)$ with the topology of m -leaf flower based at $\mathbf{x}_0$. Employing the eigenvalue-representation (5.7), one observes that for such contour the loop-average is *not* an irreducible correlator

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} < W_{\cup_{k=1}^m C_k(\mathbf{x}_0)}^f > \rightarrow N^{1-m} \prod_{k=1}^m < W_{C_k}^f > \sim O(N^{m+1-\sum_{k=1}^m L_{C_k}}), \quad (6.8)$$

in contrast to the pattern of conventional gauge theories. Upon a reflection, the large N scaling (6.8) holds true for the average of an arbitrary loop (1.7) which after removing all the sites with self-intersections is splitted into m disjoint nonself-intersecting contours C_k . Complementary, after subtraction of all the higher-order 'reducible' parts (contributing as $\sim O(N^{2+p-\sum_{k=1}^m L_{C_k}})$, $p > 0$) the irreducible correlator (6.2) of m th order is supposed to obey (6.1). In particular, for $m = 2$ we expect that

$$| < W_{\cup_{k=1}^2 C_k(\mathbf{x}_0)}^f > - \frac{1}{N} \prod_{k=1}^2 < W_{C_k(\mathbf{x}_0)}^f > | \sim O(N^{2-L_{C_1}-L_{C_2}}). \quad (6.9)$$

In the case of a contour with self-intersections along links, the associated average generically is not irreducible either. The additional reason here is

the existence of the (irreducible) one-link correlators (with $\forall R_k \in Y_{n_k}^{(N)}$)

$$\langle \chi_{R_1}(U_\rho(\mathbf{z})) \chi_{R_2}(U_\rho^+(\mathbf{z})) \rangle \sim O\left(\prod_{k=1}^2 \dim R_k\right) \quad , \quad n_1 = n_2 \bmod N, \quad (6.10)$$

which depend nontrivially on the relevant coupling constants $\{b_r\}$. As a result, the scaling (6.1) is generically modified as well.

6.1 Comments on the local large N $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ -symmetry.

Next, let us return to the interpretation of the unconventional pattern (6.1) of a nonself-intersecting loop average in the gauge theories induced from the eigenvalue-systems (1.6). From the viewpoint of the generic pattern (4.3),(4.4) of the matrix theories with the $O(N^2)$ free energy, the scaling (6.1) indicates the additional N^{1-L_C} -suppression. In the more general case (6.4), the corresponding irreducible average is down in magnitude by the factor $(\prod_{p=1}^B N^{1-L_{C_p}})$. One might expect that (in the WC phase) the latter is the result of a specific *cancellation* between different Feynman diagrams (each scaling individually in compliance with the standard pattern (6.3)). As this cancellation is *not* manifest within the formal WC series, we have to return to the specifics of the original eigenvalue-models. As we will see, in the framework of the saddle-point (SP) method, the extra $(\prod_{p=1}^B N^{1-L_{C_p}})$ -factor can be traced back to the otherwise unobservable local $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ -symmetry (2.11) of the leading $O(N^2)$ order of the effective action $S_{eff}(\{\omega^{(0)}\})$ (see eq. (2.6)) restricted to the SP orbit $\{\omega^{(0)}\}$.

To this aim observe first that, were not the invariance (2.11), in the average of the product (1.8) each trace could be substituted in the large N limit by its SP value $\chi_f(\omega^{(0)}(\rho_k|\mathbf{z}_k))$ (modulo (1.5) and the $\mathbf{Z}_N$ gauge transformations (1.4) both invisible for a closed loop C). Altogether, it would result in the conventional $O(N)$ -scaling and *trivial* perimeter-law pattern of the large N loop-average (1.7). It is the additional averaging over the $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ -orbit (2.11) which ensures that (in the eigenvalue-systems (1.6)) the leading $O(N)$ contribution to $\langle W_C^f \rangle$ is exactly cancelled. Indeed, assume for a moment that one would neglect completely the subleading $O(N^{1-\beta})$, $\beta \geq 0$, orders of $S_{eff}(\{\omega(\phi)\})$ in eq. (2.6). In this 'approximation', the fluctuations (in the background of the SP orbit $\omega^{(0)}(\rho_k|\mathbf{z}_k)$ generated by (1.4), (1.5) and

(2.10)) induced by the infinitesimal transformations (2.11) become exactly *zero* modes. The contribution of these modes would render an arbitrary correlator (1.8) identically zero for any nonself-intersecting loop C

$$\langle W_C^f \rangle \rightarrow N^{1-L_C} \prod_{\{\mathbf{z}_k \in L_C\}} \sum_{t(\mathbf{z}_k) \in \mathbf{Z}_N} t(\mathbf{z}_k) \chi_f(\omega^{(0)}(\rho_k|\mathbf{z}_k)) = 0 \quad (6.11)$$

because such W_C^f does *not* contain the singlet component with respect to the $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ -averaging over $t(\mathbf{z}_k) \in \mathbf{Z}_N$.

The inclusion of the *subleading* orders of $S_{eff}(\{\omega(\phi)\})$ breaks (2.11) down to (1.4), (1.5) which makes the above modes *quasizero*. In turn, it justifies that the large N loop-averages (associated to a nonself-intersecting contour) are nonvanishing. On the other hand, the cancellation (6.11) indeed foreshadows the N^{1-L_C} -suppressed scaling (6.1). To make it manifest, consider the 2-loop average

$$\langle |W_C^f|^2 \rangle \sim O(N^2) , \quad (6.12)$$

with $|W_C^f|^2$ being invariant under (2.11). As it is clear from the SP method, the leading $O(N^2)$ -order of (6.12) is accumulated (in contrast to the ordinary gauge theories) by the reducible part composed of the $n_1 = n_2 = 1$ correlators (6.10). This substantiates that the $N \rightarrow \infty$ average (1.7) is necessarily suppressed compared to the conventional $B = 1$ $O(N)$ -pattern (6.3).

7 Conclusions.

In this paper we have proposed to induce a class of $SU(N)$ lattice gauge theories from the novel family of the vector-field eigenvalue-models (1.6) (or their generalizations) employing the mapping (1.9). The latter models, in addition to the local $[U(N)]^D$ conjugation-invariance (1.3), are endowed with the $\mathbf{Z}_N$ gauge symmetry (1.4) and global $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ invariance (1.5). The crucial consequence of (1.3) is that *both* the action (1.6) *and* the Wilson loop averages (1.8) depend nontrivially only on the *eigenvalues* $\omega(\rho_k|\mathbf{z}_k)$ of the relevant link-variables.

Consequently, both the partition function $\tilde{X}_{L^D}$ (composed of (2.1)) and the loop-averages (1.8) can be rewritten in terms of the GLR coefficients (2.2) parametrized by $O(N)$ integers. In turn, the $1/N$ expansion of both the free energy and (1.8) can be reformulated as the semiclassical series provided that $-\ln[\tilde{X}_{L^D}] \sim O(N^2)$. In this perspective, the eigenvalue-models (1.6) facilitate a master-field representation of the associated induced gauge systems. Recall also that in any literally continuum system the local conjugation-invariance (1.3) is *not* consistent (even at the classical level) with the presence of any *finite* number of derivative-dependent terms in the action. Thus, from the viewpoint of the continuum YM theory, the invariance (1.3) of (1.6) is to be interpreted as the huge auxiliary symmetry introduced by the judicious *discretization* (regularization) of both the action and the space-time.

In the large N limit, the partition function of (1.6) is reproduced (via (1.14)) by the (L^D th power of the) reduced generating functional (1.17) of the GLR coefficients which can be further transformed into the 1-matrix representation (1.19). To be even more specific, the 1-matrix eigenvalue-model in (1.19) is selected in the simplest form (1.20) which makes accessible the complete large N phase structure of the $D \geq 2$ induced gauge theories. In particular, we pay the special attention to the issue of the continuum limit (CL) in the latter theories. The important place in this analysis is played by the scaling-condition (4.6), imposed on the effective 1-matrix system (1.19). As it is demonstrated, this condition predetermines that in the induced gauge system the localization $\{U_\rho(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow \hat{1}\}$ of the link-variables takes place which is tantamount to CL. Also the phenomenon of the auxiliary 'continuum' limits is discussed.

The computation of the large N Wilson loop averages $\langle W_C^f \rangle$ is particularly simple in the $D = 2$ case where the concise representation (5.11) is derived for generic nonself-intersecting loop C on an arbitrary $2d$ surface. Building on the transparent relation with $\langle W_C^f \rangle$ evaluated in the ordinary $2d$ gauge theories, we reveal the peculiar modification (6.4) of the standard pattern (6.3) of the $1/N$ -topological expansion. However the physical mass-scale (like the string tension in (5.11)) is adjusted to scale as $O(N^0)$, and the large N factorization is expected to remain present. Therefore, we conclude that the additional N^{1-L_C} -suppression (6.1) does *not* prevent to consider the induced gauge systems as the eligible large N cousins of the conven-

tional $SU(3)$ lattice gauge theories. Moreover, it is reasonable to expect that the $O(N^0)$ physical string tension (if any) in the induced lattice YM system reproduces that in the associated continuum large N YM theory. It is supported, in particular, by the explicit $D = 2$ derivations of Section 5.1.

Definitely, the most ambitious goal of our project is to find an approach for computation of the $D = 4$ large N loop-averages in the proposed induced systems adjusted to have the proper continuum limit. If successful, it might provide with the framework appropriate to address the issue of confinement in the standard $D = 4$ *continuum* $SU(N)$ theory in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. Unfortunately, the $D = 2$ technique of Section 5, being directly generalized to $D \geq 3$, does not seem to provide with a practical scheme. More promising direction is to synthesize the latter technique with the $1/N$ saddle-point method applied to the eigenvalues $\omega(\rho_k|\mathbf{z}_k)$ employing the appropriate representation (1.8) of $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle W_C^f \rangle$. The actual analysis in this framework is additionally complicated by the presence of the quazero modes associated to the $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ symmetry (2.11) of the leading $O(N^2)$ order of the effective action $S_{eff}(\{\omega^{(0)}\})$ (defined by eq. (2.6)) restricted to the SP orbit $\{\omega^{(0)}\}$. As a result, even in the computation of $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle W_C^f \rangle$ it looks necessary to take into account the *subleading* orders of $S_{eff}(\{\omega\})$. Nevertheless, one might expect that the presumable large N factorization (6.4) foreshadows potential simplifications. Clearly, it calls for a new piece of technology to be developed.

Acknowledgements.

I am grateful to Yu.Makeenko and A.Polyakov for useful discussions and would like to thank A.Losev, A.Mironov, A.Morozov, G.Semenoff for interesting comments and questions. This project was started when the author was the NATO/NCSE Fellow at University of British Columbia, and I would like to thank all the stuff and especially Gordon Semenoff for hospitality. The paper is also partially supported by the CDRF grant RP1-253.

Appendix A: The local $[Z_N]^D$ -invariance.

In this appendix we discuss the local $[Z_N]^D$ -symmetry (2.11) of the leading $O(N^2)$ order of the effective action $S_{eff}(\{\omega^{(0)}\})$ (defined in eq. (2.6)) restricted to the SP values $\{\omega^{(0)}\}$. Owing to $S(D(D-1)/2)$ invariance (1.13), it suffices to consider the simpler version of the $SU(N)$ plaquette-factor (1.6) with the sum running over the single species R_2

$$Z(\{\omega(\phi)\}) = \sum_{R_2} e^{-S(R_2)} \prod_{\{\mu\nu\}} \chi_{R_2}(\omega(\mu|\mathbf{x})) \dots \chi_{\bar{R}_2}(\omega(\nu|\mathbf{x})), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $S(R_2) = S(\bar{R}_2)$ and $\phi \in \mathbf{z} \otimes \rho$.

Our purpose is to demonstrate that the $SU(N)$ SP solution $\omega^{(0)}(\phi)$ is supposed to be *unique* and $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -selfdual (where $\chi_R(\omega(\phi)) = [\chi_R(\bar{\omega}(\phi))]^+$)

$$\omega_j^{(0)}(\phi) = -\omega_{N-j+1}^{(0)}(\phi) \equiv \bar{\omega}_j^{(0)}(\phi) \pmod{S(N) \otimes [\mathbf{Z}_N]^D}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

modulo the Weyl $S(N)$ group (2.10) combined with the $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ transformations (2.11). To this aim, one first observes that the factor (A.1) is by construction $\mathbf{Z}_2$ selfdual $Z(\{\omega(\phi)\}) = Z^+(\{\omega(\phi)\}) = Z(\{\bar{\omega}(\phi)\})$. It implies that on the SP orbit, generated by the relevant symmetries to be determined, there is a point corresponding to a $\mathbf{Z}_2$ selfdual (modulo (2.10)) solution $\{\omega^{(0)}(\phi)\}$. Consider the SP suborbit generated from the above $\mathbf{Z}_2$ invariant solution by the (local) Weyl group (2.10). In this case, the corresponding stronger version of the constraint (A.2) is tantamount to the reality of the character $\chi_R(\omega(\phi)) = [\chi_R(\omega(\phi))]^+$ for *any* (not necessarily selfdual) irrep R . In turn, the latter property is sufficient for the selfconsistency of the localization (3.1) on $R_2^{(0)} = \bar{R}_2^{(0)}$: otherwise the effective action $S_{eff}(R_2|\{\omega(\phi)\})$ for R_2

$$\sum_{R_2} e^{-S_{eff}(R_2|\{\omega(\phi)\})} = Z(\{\omega(\phi)\}) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

would not be $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -selfdual with respect to the interchange $R_2 \leftrightarrow \bar{R}_2$.

Now we are in a position to prove $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ transformations (2.11) of the above $S(N)$ suborbit $\{\omega^{(0)}(\phi)\}_{S(N)}$. Let us introduce the twisted action $S_{eff}(R_2, t|\{\omega(\phi)\})$, resulting (akin to (A.3)) from eq. (A.1) after the $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ -deformation of the characters $\chi_R(V)$ involved,

$$\chi_R(V) \rightarrow \chi_R(tV) = t^{n(R)} \chi_R(V) \quad ; \quad t = e^{i \frac{2\pi m}{N}} \in Z_N, \quad R \in Y_{n(R)}^{(N)}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

(where $n(R)$ is defined by (3.5)) so that $Z(\{\omega(\phi)\}) \rightarrow Z(\{\omega(\phi)\}, t)$. We claim that $S_{eff}(R_2, t|\{\omega^{(0)}(\phi)\})$ remains to be $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -selfdual

$$S_{eff}(R_2, t|\{\omega^{(0)}(\phi)\}) = S_{eff}(\bar{R}_2, t|\{\omega^{(0)}(\phi)\}) \quad (\text{A.5})$$

provided that $\{\omega^{(0)}(\phi)\} \in \{\omega^{(0)}(\phi)\}_{SU(N)}$, i.e. fulfils the stronger version of (A.2) where the $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ group is omitted. Moreover, we assert that (for such $\{\omega^{(0)}(\phi)\}$) the resulting from (A.4) sum (A.3) over $SU(N)$ irreps R_2 is localized for $\forall t \in Z_N$ on the same $R_2^{(0)}(t) = R_2^{(0)}(1) \equiv R_2^{(0)}$ as before $[\mathbf{Z}_N]^D$ -twisting. In turn, it is evidently tantamount to the invariance of the leading $O(N^2)$ order of $S_{eff}(\{\omega^{(0)}\})$ (defined by eq. (2.6)) under (2.11).

To prove these statements, one notes first that the explicit form (3.7) of $\mathbf{Z}_2$ transformation yields $\exp(n(R)\ln[t]) = \exp(-n(\bar{R})\ln[t])$. As only the real part of the overall twist-factor contributes into $Z(\{\omega(\phi)\}, t)$, the latter identity justifies (A.5). In the $SU(N)$ case (where $\lambda_N^{SU(N)} = 0$ see (4.22)) it implies that the saddle-point irrep is supposed to be selfdual $R_2^{(0)}(t) = \bar{R}_2^{(0)}(t)$ irrespectively of t . To justify $R_2^{(0)}(t) = R_2^{(0)}(1)$, we employ the elligibility to restrict the large N twisted sum (A.3) to that over $SU(N)$ selfdual irreps $R_2 = \bar{R}_2$ for which $N\lambda_1 = 2\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \in [2\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}]$ so that $t^{n(R_2)} = \exp[i\pi(\lambda_1 - N + 1)]$. Finally, combination of the latter equation with the choice $N \in [2\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0} + 1]$ results in $\lambda_1 \in [2\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}]$ so that $t^{n(R_2)} = 1$. Presuming the 'smoothness' of the large N limit, it substantiates t -independence of $R_2^{(0)}(t)$.

Appendix B: The $D = 2$ loop-averages.

Consider the large N $D = 2$ average (5.9) of a nonself-intersecting Wilson loop in the case when $R_0 = f$ and the weight $e^{-S(R)}$ belongs to the $U(N)$ subvariety (4.26) of the pattern (1.20). To begin with, as we will see in a moment the factor $B_{LC}(R|f, A)$ scales as $O(N^{2-L_C})$ provided the integers λ_j (defining $R(\{\lambda\})$) are of order of $\sim O(N)$ in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. We assert that the large N sum in eq. (5.9) is localized on the solution $R(\{\lambda^{(0)}\}) \equiv R(\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}(t))$ of the SP equations (4.22). Indeed, recall first that a (unique, $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -selfdual) $R^{(0)} \equiv R(\{\lambda^{(0)}\})$ is the irrep on which the large N sum (5.4) (defining the partition function) is localized. It is reasonable to

presume that, for $|\lambda_j^{(0)} - \lambda_j| \sim O(\sqrt{N})$, there is such $\alpha > 0$ that

$$\frac{|B_{LC}(R(\{\lambda^{(0)}\})|f, A) - B_{LC}(R(\{\lambda\})|f, A)|}{B_{LC}(R(\{\lambda^{(0)}\})|f, A)} \sim O(N^{-\alpha}) , \quad (\text{B.1})$$

i.e. $B_{LC}(R(\{\lambda\})|f, A)$ behaves smoothly on the scale of the characteristic fluctuations of λ_j . Altogether, it justifies the above assertion.

Next, one is to derive an explicit form of $B_{LC}(R^{(0)}|f, A)$ in terms of the associated spectral density (4.25). The representation theory [6] tells that $L_{R_1|R^{(0)},f}$ is nonzero when the associated to R_1 (double) Young table can be obtained from that corresponding to $R^{(0)}$ by adding a single box in an admissible way. The latter addition is elligible into the i th row if and only if the number of boxes n_i in this row (see eq. (3.5)) is strictly less than in the preceeding one

$$n_i < n_{i-1} \iff (\lambda_{i-1} - \lambda_i) \geq 2 . \quad (\text{B.2})$$

According to the definitions (4.21) and (4.25) of $d\bar{\lambda}(t)/dt$ and $\rho(\eta)$, it implies that in the domain of the coupling constant(s) where $0 \leq \rho(\eta) \leq 1/2$, $\forall \eta$, the box can be generically added to *any* row of the Young table corresponding to $\rho(\eta) = (dt/dh^{(0)}(t))|_{h^{(0)}(t)=\eta}$. Indeed, owing to (B.1) one can choose any discretization $\lambda_j^{(0)}/N$, $j = 1, \dots, N$, of the continuous function $\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}(t) = h^{(0)}(t) + 1/2$ which satisfies $|N\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}(j/N) - \lambda_j^{(0)}| \ll \sqrt{N}$. Condition $\rho(\eta) \leq 1/2$ evidently ensures the existence of at least one such discretization obeying (B.2).

Due to (4.30), the constraint $\rho(\eta) \leq 1/2$ is always fulfilled in the large N WC limit $\{b_r \rightarrow 0\}$ relevant for the analysis of the continuum limit. Therefore in what follows, we will restrict our attention to the cases when $\rho(\eta) \leq 1/2$ and thus (B.2)) is valid. As a result, (by the same token as in [14]) one obtains

$$\sum_{R_1} e^{-[S(R_1) - S(R^{(0)})]A} L_{R_1|R^{(0)},f} = \int d\eta \rho(\eta) [T(\eta)]^{qA} e^{-\frac{dV(\eta)}{d\eta}A} , \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$T(h(\frac{k}{N})) = \exp\left[\sum_{i \neq k}^{N-1} \ln\left(1 + \frac{1/N}{h(\frac{k}{N}) - h(\frac{i}{N})}\right)\right] , \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where we have skipped the upperscript: $h^{(0)}(t) \equiv h(t)$. In the derivation of the above equation, we employ that when the box is added in k th row (of the Young table associated to $R^{(0)}$) then

$$V(R_1) - V(R^{(0)}) \rightarrow \sum_{m=1}^{M_0} [\tilde{b}_{2m}]^{2m} \frac{[\lambda_k^{(0)} - \frac{N-1}{2}]^{2m-1}}{N^{2m-1}} \rightarrow \frac{dV(\eta)}{d\eta} \Big|_{\eta=h(\frac{k}{N})}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$T(h(\frac{k}{N})) = \left(\frac{\dim R_1}{\dim R^{(0)}} \right) = \frac{\prod_{i \neq k} (\lambda_k^{(0)} + 1 - \lambda_i^{(0)})}{\prod_{i \neq k} (\lambda_k^{(0)} - \lambda_i^{(0)})} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where $V(R(\{\lambda\}))$ is defined by eq. (4.26).

The remaining step is to find the continuum representation for $T(\eta)$ in terms of $\rho(\eta)$. For this purpose, one is to expand the logarithm in eq. (B.4)

$$T(h(\frac{k}{N})) = - \left(\sum_{i \neq k}^{|i-k| \leq M} + \sum_{|i-k| > M} \right) \sum_{p \geq 1} \frac{1}{p} [N(h(\frac{i}{N}) - h(\frac{k}{N}))]^{-p}, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

treating $(h(\frac{k}{N}) - h(\frac{i}{N}))$ differently for small, $|i-k| \leq M$, and large, $|i-k| > M$, values of $|i-k|$ (where $M = N^\gamma$, $0 < \gamma < 1$). In the former domain, one is to substitute

$$[N(h(\frac{k}{N}) - h(\frac{i}{N}))] \rightarrow (k-i) \frac{dh(t)}{dt} \Big|_{t=\frac{k}{N}} = (k-i) \rho^{-1}(\eta) \Big|_{\eta=h(\frac{k}{N})}, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

while in the latter case the (partial) sum over i is to be transformed into

$$\sum_{|i-k| > M} [N(h(\frac{i}{N}) - h(\frac{k}{N}))]^{-p} \rightarrow N^{1-p} \int_{|x-\frac{k}{N}| > \frac{M}{N}} \frac{dx}{[h(x) - h(\frac{k}{N})]^p}. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

As it is clear from (B.9), the situation is somewhat distinct for the $p = 1$ and the $p \geq 2$ terms of the expansion (B.7). In the $p \geq 2$ case, the 'long-wavelength' term (B.9) does *not* contribute into the leading $O(N^0)$ order (of $\ln[T(\eta)]$) we are interested in for eq. (B.3). According to (B.8), the remaining 'short-wavelength' $p \geq 2$ terms are represented by the *convergent* sums which results (see [14]) in

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \neq k}^{|i-k| \leq M} \sum_{p \geq 2} \frac{[\rho(\eta)]^{-p}}{p} (i-k)^{-p} = -\ln \left(\frac{\sin(\pi \rho(\eta))}{\pi \rho(\eta)} \right), \quad (\text{B.10})$$

where $h(\frac{k}{N}) = \eta$ and the contribution of odd $p = 2m + 1$ vanishes. Complementary, in the $p = 1$ case the 'short-wavelength' contribution goes to zero while the large N limit of the 'long-wavelength' part merges with the principle value of the integral $P \int \frac{d\phi \rho(\phi)}{\eta - \phi}$. Combining all the pieces together and employing the SP equations (4.27), one arrives at (5.11).

References

- [1] K.Wilson, *Phys. Rev.* **D 10** (1974) 2445.
- [2] M.Kontsevich, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **147** (1992) 1.
- [3] V.Kazakov and A.Migdal, *Nucl. Phys.* **B397** (1993) 214.
- [4] B.Rusakov, *Mod. Phys. Lett* **A5** (1990) 693; *Phys. Lett.* **B303** (1993) 95; B.Rusakov and S.Yankielowicz *Phys. Lett.* **B339** (1994) 258.
- [5] M.Douglas and V.Kazakov, *Phys. Lett.* **B319** (1993) 219.
- [6] Wu-Ki Tung, *Group Symmetry in Physics*, WC, 1985;
W.Fulton and J.Harris, *Representation Theory*, Springer Verlag, 1991.
- [7] J.Drouffe and J.Zuber, *Phys. Rep.* **102** (1983) 1.
- [8] E.Witten, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **141** (1991) 153.
- [9] A.Migdal, *Sov. Phys. JETP*. **42** (1975) 413.
- [10] D.Gross and E.Witten, *Phys. Rev.* **D21** (1980) 446;
S.Wadia, *Phys. Lett.* **93B** (1980) 403.
- [11] E.Brezin, C. Itzykson, G.Parisi and J.Zuber, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **59** (1978) 35.
- [12] D.Gross, *Nucl. Phys.* **B400** (1993) 161; D.Gross and W.Taylor, *Nucl. Phys.* **B400** (1993) 181; *Nucl. Phys.* **B403** (1993) 395.
- [13] M.Creutz, *Quarks, Gluons and Lattices*, Cambridge Univ. Press, (1983).
- [14] J.Daul and V.Kazakov, *Phys. Lett.* **B335**, 371 (1994);
D.Boulatov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A9**, 365 (1994).